

A CRITICAL AND COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF
SHAKESPEARE'S USE OF HIS SOURCES IN SOME
OF THE EARLY AND MIDDLE COMEDIES

by

John K. Hale

Thesis Presented for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
of the University of Edinburgh in the Faculty of Arts

June 1971



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Of the many people who helped me with this dissertation I must thank two in particular. Professor Harold Jenkins gave invaluable advice on the research and writing, and shared his extraordinary insight into matters Shakespearean. To my wife, who typed the thesis and read it over with me, I owe a different but equal debt.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
1	PRINCIPLES AND METHODS OF THE STUDY.....	1
2	THE GENRE OF ROMANCE.....	34
3	THE TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA: AN EARLY ROMANTIC COMEDY.....	75
4	THE COMEDY OF ERRORS: INTRIGUE ROMANTICIZED.....	121
5	THE TAMING OF THE SHREW, LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST AND A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM.....	163
6	THE MERCHANT OF VENICE: ETHICAL ROMANCE.....	185
7	MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING: REVERSION AND FURTHER VARIATION.....	228
8	THE MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR AND ITS EMPLOYMENT OF INTRIGUE MODELS.....	256
9	AS YOU LIKE IT: PASTORAL ROMANCE.....	279
10	TWELFTH NIGHT: COMBINATION AND RECAPITULATION AND THE MATURING OF ROMANCE.....	361
11	CONCLUSION.....	443

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBREVIATIONS

Titles of Works by Shakespeare

<u>AW</u>	<u>All's Well that Ends Well</u>	<u>MM</u>	<u>Measure for Measure</u>
<u>AYL</u>	<u>As You Like It</u>	<u>MND</u>	<u>A Midsummer Night's Dream</u>
<u>CE</u>	<u>The Comedy of Errors</u>	<u>MV</u>	<u>The Merchant of Venice</u>
<u>Cym</u>	<u>Cymbeline</u>	<u>MW</u>	<u>The Merry Wives of Windsor</u>
<u>1HIV</u>	<u>Henry IV Part One</u>	<u>Oth</u>	<u>Othello</u>
<u>2HIV</u>	<u>Henry IV Part Two</u>	<u>PPT</u>	<u>Pericles Prince of Tyre</u>
<u>HV</u>	<u>Henry V</u>	<u>RJ</u>	<u>Romeo and Juliet</u>
<u>1HVI</u>	<u>Henry VI Part One</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>The Rape of Lucrece</u>
<u>2HVI</u>	<u>Henry VI Part Two</u>	<u>TC</u>	<u>Troilus and Cressida</u>
<u>3HVI</u>	<u>Henry VI Part Three</u>	<u>TGV</u>	<u>The Two Gentlemen of Verona</u>
<u>JC</u>	<u>Julius Caesar</u>	<u>TN</u>	<u>Twelfth Night</u>
<u>KL</u>	<u>King Lear</u>	<u>TS</u>	<u>The Taming of The Shrew</u>
<u>LLL</u>	<u>Love's Labour's Lost</u>	<u>VA</u>	<u>Venus and Adonis</u>
<u>MA</u>	<u>Much Ado about Nothing</u>	<u>WT</u>	<u>The Winter's Tale</u>

Other Abbreviations

<u>E.E.T.S.</u>	<u>Early English Text Society</u>
<u>e.s.</u>	<u>extra series</u>
<u>esp.</u>	<u>especially</u>
<u>HN</u>	<u>Head-note</u>
<u>n.s.</u>	<u>new series</u>
<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Stage Direction</u>
<u>S.R.</u>	<u>Stationers' Register</u>

SUMMARY

Hitherto the study of Shakespeare's literary sources has mainly sought to establish their identity rather than to evaluate his use of them--not least for the comedies up to and including Twelfth Night. The present source-study, however, is critically oriented. It attempts a systematic comparison of the texts of these comedies with their sources, wherever there exists a reasonable measure of agreement as to their identity, in the hope of providing a firmer basis for critical interpretation proper.

Chapter One outlines the methods and scope of the undertaking. Its paramount concern is to enlarge the concept of "source" to include, besides the primary category of a story-source, the categories of story-tradition, story-type and genre; and to stress that Shakespeare's own earlier work may itself be a source.

Chapter Two focusses on one of these less accepted categories, the genre of romance, because it is influential for the comedies--whether as a quarry for specific typical situations or as a force shaping themes and structure. Four main elements of romance are discerned: adventures; marvel; love; and sens, the underlying meaning of a romance. A development is found within the romance writing of the Renaissance towards a greater concentration on the third of these elements, although it subsumes rather than extrudes the other three. It is suggested that Shakespeare's growth as a writer of comedy is in large part owed to a maturing in his handling of romance, from a straightforward use of its conventions to a probing of its meaning.

In Chapter Three the methods and ideas outlined are applied to one of the earlier comedies, The Two Gentlemen of Verona. There is a detailed exposition of the play's indebtedness to a multifarious story-tradition and a particular story-source, which Shakespeare has ingeniously combined. It is argued that the play's perennial unpopularity does not stem from its combination of stories, which is already accomplished and bold, but from an infelicitous handling of genre—specifically, romance.

Chapter Four considers a different set of source-relationships, those of The Comedy of Errors. Although this play too combines two stories, one from a story-source and another from a more diffused story-tradition, Shakespeare makes a more discriminating use of romance materials and attitudes, leavening them with the methods, and to some extent the attitudes, of classical intrigue comedy.

Further diversity is traced in Chapter Five, which considers The Taming of the Shrew, Love's Labour's Lost and A Midsummer Night's Dream. The first two remain intractable from our point of view because there are not clear or illuminating story-sources or traditions, and accordingly the plays are only briefly discussed; but A Dream is more rewarding. Not only does it combine different types of source-materials but is the first Shakespearean comedy in which the state of knowledge of the chronology of the comedies permits debts to earlier comedies to be discerned. In addition it combines genres brilliantly, surpassing Errors by penetrating more deeply into the nature of romance at the same time as it continues the leavening of romance with intrigue.

In Chapter Six The Merchant of Venice provides another opportunity to watch Shakespeare selecting and altering, omitting and adding as he works up a single main story-source. Analysis of this process reveals how he clarifies the moral issues, eliminates ethical naivety, and gives to the four basic characters a more representative, in fact more human dimension. Subsidiary sources are used to amplify the sparse character-lines of the main source, but amplification is assisted also by the characters' generic affiliates.

Much Ado about Nothing, which is the subject of Chapter Seven, contributes a developing sense both of Shakespeare's diversity of compositional method and of his exploration of romance. On the one hand he weds two plots, one of which belongs to a well-ramified story-tradition while the other is his own invention: on the other hand both plots develop an attitude to romance which, by rejecting certain of its blatant conventions, penetrates the better to its view of life.

Diversity becomes yet more manifest in the discussion of The Merry Wives of Windsor in Chapter Eight. This play has no specific story-sources but rather exploits several types of story, and the types in question refer us to generic models in fabliau and intrigue, to a degree unprecedented in the comedies. A further peculiarity of the play is its revival of characters from Shakespeare's own earlier work, from the histories. Yet plot, and even characterization, are shaped by the needs of the intrigue, even if this confounds the expectation of continuity with the histories which the fact of revival naturally generates.

As You Like It, which is examined in Chapter Nine, is the opposite of The Merry Wives in all these respects. In the first place it owes nothing to intrigue, but much to romance, especially pastoral romance; and most of all to the power of pastoral and romance alike to accommodate diversities of character and attitude. In the second place the play follows a single story-source more closely than any other play of our group does: the opportunity is taken for a full analysis of Shakespeare's reworking of Lodge's novel Rosalynde. It is noted, for example, how often he redistributes incidents; balances and ironically juxtaposes characters; and criticizes the inherent attitudes of his genre while yet sympathizing with them. Negatively, the indebtedness of the verbal texture is not as great or as systematic as might be expected.

Twelfth Night, the subject of Chapter Ten, is both a culmination and a new departure in respect to the tendencies observed in the other comedies. Its sources are a complex mingling of story-sources and story-traditions; also of Shakespeare's own earlier plays, yet the manner of its repetitions bears little resemblance to those of The Merry Wives; so that combination and diversity are more than ever noticeable. Moreover in its use of romance, again seasoned with the methods of intrigue, Shakespeare penetrates more deeply than ever to the inner structure and meaning of romance—a penetration which is therefore traced in some detail. Nevertheless the play sometimes abandons the well-tried models, for Feste and Malvolio in different ways defy and question the apparent triumph of romance perceptions.

At the very moment when, in recapitulating them, Shakespeare understands them more deeply than before he adds rival perceptions and incipient rival world-views. Here above all Shakespeare is not only a borrower, or even a recreator, but an initiator.

In the brief Conclusion therefore three main tendencies are recognized in Shakespeare's use of sources. First, he has an outstanding ability to select, modify and combine stories, whose excellence--singly or in combination--often appears only once Shakespeare has revealed it. This ability is remarkably mature from the outset. Second, however, he gains increasing insight into the human implications and philosophical repercussions of his frequently conventional materials: a deepening insight which is, I believe, connected with his exploration of the romance genre. This capacity is by no means mature from the outset, but rather is what distinguishes As You Like It and Twelfth Night as the masterpieces of his preferred comic style. Yet third, source-study testifies that much of Shakespeare's power as a writer of comedy lies in what he adds. Thus in its own way the study of his indebtedness to sources pays tribute to his originality.

CHAPTER ONE

PRINCIPLES AND METHODS OF THE STUDY.

Charlotte Lennox, who published the first printed collection of Shakespeare sources, Shakespear Illustrated, in 1753-4, thought that when he elaborated a story beyond its form in the source he frequently marred it. Not many subsequent students of this matter have shared her opinion. Most take it for granted that the stories have been greatly improved in becoming the plays we know, and indeed such an assumption is almost always appropriate. But as a result source-study has often become primarily factual, concerned to show which works Shakespeare quarried or reflected: in the course of attempts to identify sources argument has tended to proceed from the plays to the sources. Accordingly there has been wholesale neglect of interpretative questions: given that a play has such-and-such sources to what use has Shakespeare put them? How dependent or how inventive has he been? These questions and others like them must certainly follow, not precede, the identification of sources. Yet just as interpretation without a factual basis is irresponsible, so identification without interpretation is pointless, yielding only a dead heap of facts. If then, as I shall argue, a century and more of source-hunting has established what may reasonably be called a consensus as to most of the sources of most of the plays, it is time for argument to proceed in the reverse direction--from the sources to the plays. Source-study may once more serve criticism. Perhaps it can especially serve the understanding of plays which seem to have responded least

to other critical approaches; plays which indeed, despite the present plethora of works on Shakespeare, have been less often and less satisfactorily treated in critical studies. I refer to the comedies of his early writing years and his early maturity, namely As You Like It, The Comedy of Errors, Love's Labour's Lost, The Merchant of Venice, The Merry Wives of Windsor, A Midsummer Night's Dream, Much Ado about Nothing, The Taming of the Shrew, Twelfth Night and The Two Gentlemen of Verona.¹

This dissertation does not claim to be the first critical source-study of course, not even for these particular plays. A survey, necessarily brief, of studies whose intentions correspond or overlap with mine will help to establish its genus and differentia: the general perspective should clarify its specific objectives.

Works devoted to sources in general are few. What there are are chiefly collections, such as J.P. Collier's Shakespeare's Library (1843),² the Shakespeare Classics series, of which Sir Israel Gollancz was General Editor, and latterly the Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare of G. Bullough.³ Most of these collections include introductions or essays which interpret Shake-

¹The "Problem Plays", All's Well That Ends Well, Measure for Measure and Troilus and Cressida, and the four late romances, Cymbeline, Pericles, The Tempest and The Winter's Tale, are also comedies; but they are so in different ways, and in any case have received more attention than the above group of comedies. Which of the latter will be discussed most fully, and their chronological relationships, are explained later in the chapter.

²The place of publication of works cited is London unless stated otherwise.

³1957-. Seven volumes are planned, of which six have appeared. It is this collection of sources which is chiefly used in the present study.

Shakespeare's use of the sources that they document and are often valuable, Bullough's essays which introduce his extracts for each play being particularly constructive. It is inevitable though regrettable that his critical remarks are usually confined to the play being discussed at any given time, but even so he gives us far more of critical value than his primary intention of newly compiling the sources would necessitate.

Of books devoted entirely to Shakespeare's use of his sources there still seems to be only one: K. Muir, Shakespeare's Sources, 1957. In his Preface to the first volume, Comedies and Tragedies, he truly remarks (p.vii) that "there would seem to be room for an attempt to survey the subject as a whole", but emphasizes the difficulties of the undertaking and his own hesitations. The fact that his second volume, promising discussion of the Histories and offering conclusions, has not yet been published appears to confirm the difficulties foreseen. Nevertheless there are also difficulties in the published volume which might have been avoided, for though Muir engages to discuss the use of sources he often hunts and canvasses new sources.¹ He seems half committed after all to the factual rather than the critical inquiry, and though he achieves many new insights, especially regarding debts in the verbal texture,

¹Cf. esp. the discussions of MND and KL. (Abbreviations, e.g. of play-titles, are listed together at the beginning of the dissertation).

the duality of purpose prevents his book from becoming the full survey he rightly desiderates.

Other source-studies tend to be more limited in scope than we require. Editions of plays often include a sound discussion of source-use in their introductions, those of the New Arden Shakespeare being especially good; yet they naturally do not discuss the sources of plays other than the one being introduced, and cannot allow source-study to usurp space owed to the text, stage history and the other topics normally reviewed in such introductions. Articles and books tend to work within similar limits. While there are valuable articles devoted to the source-study of individual plays,¹ most have limited space or limited reference beyond a single play (the two factors being related). As for books, there are few enough critical source-studies, and those that have been written seldom discuss more than one play, let alone a related group of plays. Moreover they have operated within too narrow a conception of "source": thus even C.T. Prouty's book The Sources of Much Ado about Nothing,² which rightly qualifies the naive view that Shakespeare's story-sources were his only sources, in effect prolongs the naivety by stressing story-tradition at the expense of story-sources and other kinds of literary source.

¹E.g. those of Erna M. Gill, "A Comparison of the Characters in The Comedy of Errors with those in the Menaechmi", U. of Texas Studies in English, V, 1925, pp.79-95, and the same author's "The Plot-Structure of The Comedy of Errors in Relation to its Sources", *ibid.*, X, 1930, pp.13-65.

²New Haven, 1950.

Other studies, while not confining their attention to a single play but considering groups of plays, are limited all the same because they consider their group under an aspect which is itself special. Thus H.R.D. Anders, Shakespeare's Books,¹ codifies the occasions when Shakespeare's language corresponds with language used by his European or English predecessors and contemporaries. V.K. Whitaker in Shakespeare's Use of Learning² goes beyond codification to analysis of the manner and quality of the dramatist's intellectual assimilation. Unfortunately he follows Anders in becoming bogged down in details, operating with snippets of "thought" as Anders does with snippets of language. Whitaker, as a disciple of T.W. Baldwin, has another deficiency, one to be found on a more monumental scale in the latter's works³ on "literary genetics". This consists in the belief that having found a precedent in, say, Aphthonius for an idea expressed in Shakespeare we have found its source. Much that may be paralleled from the classics occurs in Shakespeare; but so vast was the accumulation of civilised commonplace in the sixteenth century, so manifold the routes--not forgetting conversation, hearsay and personal experience--by which an idea could have reached him, that the arguments of Baldwin, Whitaker and Anders often seem forced. Have not they too a conception of source that is inadequate; an incomprehension of

¹ Berlin, 1904.

² San Marino, 1953.

³ Shakespeare's Five-Act Structure, Urbana, 1947, On the Literary Genetics of Shakespeare's Plays, 1592-1594, Urbana, 1959, and On the Compositional Genetics of The Comedy of Errors, Urbana, 1965.

how literary traditions might influence Shakespeare?¹ But these studies may at times assist our purposes, if only as quarries of particular source-debts, just as to some extent their purposes do not coincide with ours.

Nevertheless there are works which profess less relevance to critical source-study and have purposes mainly tangential to ours, but understand better some vital pervasive sources of Shakespeare's inspiration, and how these might suggest tones and themes to a dramatic poet. The best of these is M. Doran's Endeavors of Art,² which places Shakespeare in a context of Renaissance dramatic theory and practice. Because she adroitly balances theory and practice she provides extraordinary illumination of Shakespeare's use of the traditional genres—comedy, romance, farce, pastoral and so on. G.K. Hunter's study, John Lyly (1962), relates Shakespeare's comedies, singly and as a whole, with those of his most polished native predecessor. Avoiding the relatively jejune task of amassing verbal parallels he shows the less tangible but more abiding debt Shakespeare owed to Lyly as model. M.C. Bradbrook explores the literary ancestry of the comedies in two valuable studies, Shakespeare and Elizabethan Poetry (1951) and The Growth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy (1955).³ A number of other studies might

¹Cf. G.K. Hunter, reviewing T.W. Baldwin, On the Literary Genetics of Shakespeare's Plays. 1592-1594, RES, n.s. XII, 1961, pp.189-195.

²Madison, Wisconsin, 1954.

³These works are referred to and quoted in the Penguin (Peregrine) editions, 1964 and 1963 respectively, their pagination being unfortunately different from the pagination of the originals.

be mentioned, like A.B. Harbage's on the audiences and theatrical traditions which awaited Shakespeare's manipulation, or C.L. Barber's on his relationship with English festive traditions:¹ all these traditions, literary or not, were among his resources for comedy. Perhaps, to guard against too narrow an understanding of the term "source", everything that can be called a "resource" of Shakespeare should be admitted also as a "source". Yet some exclusion is imperative, and it will shortly be seen that the present study must proceed by compromise: while the conception of source is wider than usual, it must normally remain limited to literary sources.² It must exclude even so many minutiae of quotation and verbal parallel, and at the other extreme the broad indebtedness of Shakespeare to the world-views and thought-forms of his age.

Accordingly, although we cannot attempt a total survey of the use of literary resources even within the chosen group of comedies, it should now be clear what kind of lacuna we will attempt to fill. In the first place the sources will be studied for the light they cast on the plays, not vice versa. In the second place the concept of a

¹ Harbage's books referred to are Shakespeare's Audience, New York, 1941, As They Liked It, New York, 1947, and Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions, New York, 1952. Barber's book is Shakespeare's Festive Comedy, Princeton, 1959.

² This necessity is in fact an advantage, for as R.D. Altick, The Art of Literary Research, New York, 1963, p.80, says, "the chief debt any work of art owes is to its predecessors in the same medium... In addition, the evidence of literary indebtedness as a rule is much more concrete than that of other kinds of 'inspiration', because we have, for whatever it may prove to be worth, the testimony of printed pages laid side by side."

literary source will be enlarged beyond the story-sources which suggested events or verbal detail to Shakespeare. In the third place the comedies will be considered together, as well as in isolation. Since Shakespeare's own earlier work is not the least important of his sources, it must be given its proper place within the enlarged concept of what sources are: the essentially critical intention must be *inter alia* comparative. No single one of these objectives is unique, but in combination and applied to a group of relatively neglected plays I believe they are.

There are of course disadvantages to such an undertaking. Consideration of some is better reserved for the present but two stand out at once. One is a danger arising in the particular, the other is an objection on principle. The first danger is that constant critical comparison of written sources with play-texts can breed a lack of proportion. Not every similarity or difference between the two is of equal significance, though at the time of detection they can seem so, and some are so minor as to be mere accidents of composition. All one can do is to keep reasserting one's sense of proportion, and to admit that in the end any two students may not agree about how much can reasonably be ascribed to accidents of composition.

The second ground of objection is that although critics of source-handling are tempted to move from observing how Shakespeare used and altered his materials to inferring why he did so, his intentions are bound to be less clear than his effects. A complex and controversial question is raised, and although this is no place to canvass it fully I must at least state my position. A purist might

argue that there should be no attempt whatsoever to gauge an author's intention. All we have is his work, the thing made, the effect: questions of intention are psychological questions, irrelevant to literary criticism and probably unanswerable. This doctrine of the intentional fallacy is always extreme, but especially for the present type of source-study. The more clearly we see how Shakespeare changed a story--and its atmosphere or moral tone most of all--the harder it is to deny that the change of effect represents a different intention. When for example he constructs the plot of The Two Gentlemen from Montemayor and the Titus-Gisippus tradition, he does it in such a way that every lover can finally be requited, whereas the one source had left a woman, the other usually a man, unrequited.¹ How can we avoid concluding that Shakespeare wanted his different ending and intended a different conception of romance?² On the other hand although fear of committing the intentional fallacy should not always inhibit the comparison of source with text it does instil a helpful caution into such comparisons. Moreover as regards comparisons of one Shakespeare play with another this caution can be still more helpful: while I believe that he sometimes re-employs ideas remembered from his own earlier work, it cannot be inferred that when he does not so repeat himself he is dissatisfied with that work. The opposite inference, or no inference, might be true. Nor is later work always and necessarily better work.

¹ Cf. below, Chapter Three.

² Cf. J.R. Brown, Shakespeare and his Comedies, 1957, p.28.

Let us then classify the kinds of literary source which are to be examined. First in the history of source-criticism came the search for Shakespeare's main story-lines. However much the concept of source may need widening, it remains true that his plainest debt is to the originals of his main stories--to Menaechmi in Errors, for example, or to Rosalynde in As You Like It; for every Shakespeare play tells a story, and succeeds or fails by the interest it arouses or does not arouse in the tale of what happens to its characters. The point is probably platitudinous, but may be worth making now that criticism in general has become so sophisticated and frequently, in the search for themes and patterns, oblique.

It is however necessary to make certain distinctions and qualifications, since the concept of "main story-source" is not entirely self-explanatory. In As You Like It Shakespeare is using Rosalynde in what is a paradigm case of main story-source. In Much Ado on the other hand, though he uses the widespread story of the Lady Maliciously Slandered, it is not certain which version (or versions) he knew. Sometimes therefore we know the main story and the version(s) used, whereas at other times we know the source but not the version.¹

There comes a point however where a source-story is found in so many versions, or where translation has so far become adaptation, that it is no longer useful to speak of a main story-source

¹ Esp. when the story is in Italian and he could have used the Italian, or a translation into French or English, or some combination of these possibilities.

and a plurality of versions. It becomes more natural to speak of a story-tradition. Just as the fate of Pyramus or Cleopatra or Troilus was related many times, to varying effect, and hence it is advisable to consider Shakespeare's contributions in the light of the whole tradition (which they in turn alter); so most of our group of comedies can be considered in the perspective provided by their story-traditions. Indeed, while there is value in such placing for them all, some of them must be so placed. Twelfth Night for instance has a tale of Barnabe Riche as main story-source, but draws on other versions of its Twins story.

Going a stage further we sometimes find that a story of Shakespeare resists the attempt to relate it exclusively to a story-tradition, yet may be related to a kind of story. The clearest example is The Merry Wives of Windsor, in which the tricks played on Falstaff and Ford do not depend very directly on a story-source or story-tradition, yet may usefully be related to two medieval kinds of story--tales of a lover rebuffed, and tales of a husband duped. Similarly in Love's Labour's Lost, though no source has been found for the main story of the young men who abandon scholarship for courtship, the same type of situation occurs in Munday's Zelauto or indeed Shakespeare's own Shrew. But now in speaking of a type, or kind, of story we are only a step away from referring to the traditional literary "kinds", or genres, as a species of source. The genres in fact were important sources of inspiration, for in them Shakespeare had a great reservoir of typical stories, stock situations, ideas, characters and attitudes. These were available at any time, irrespective of whether he was following a main

story-source. In As You Like It, for example, where Rosalynde offered him so much, he added further pastoral characters like Audrey and William in accordance with the precedent of earlier pastoral romance.¹

The categories of literary source—story-source, story-tradition and genre—merge into one another at some point: we are dealing with a continuum, not a set of clearly independent ideas. The same applies to the distinction between main and subsidiary story-sources. Not every main story-source helped Shakespeare as much as Rosalynde did: here too there is a variety of source-relationship across the plays. Some plays, The Two Gentlemen for example, have more than one source, of almost equal standing, while others have no "subsidiary" sources, or no known source at all. Naturally too a subsidiary story may have been known from more than one version, or from a tradition or genre, just as main stories may. It must be appreciated therefore that our classification of types of source is not rigid, nor intended to be; and that some of the distinctions overlap, for we have seen that main and subsidiary story-sources may both stem from a tradition or a genre or a single text. Notwithstanding these qualifications the distinctions should be clear and effective enough, so long as our paradigm cases are borne in mind.

The final source-category is Shakespeare's own earlier work. Here the paradigm case is Twelfth Night, which repeats

¹Comic rusticity is found in Sidney's Arcadia, alongside the normally higher pastoral tone (Damoetas and his family).

situations from Errors and The Two Gentlemen. The repeated elements are found also in the main source for the play, so that there may seem to be conflict or contradiction in my position. Rather I believe the example shows the need for flexibility in our categories and proves their value, for in this example Shakespeare is using different types of source simultaneously. Ideas, similar or identical, come to him from stories he has read, the genre and his own earlier writing, and in doing so they reinforce and fertilize each other. In such a way can source-study begin to suggest how Shakespeare's conception of a play germinated and grew.

Now that 1) main story-source 2) subsidiary story-source 3) story-tradition 4) genre and 5) Shakespeare's own work have been identified as our working source-categories, we can consider how they will be used. What questions can be asked of the play-texts with their assistance and what kind of answers--speaking as yet in the broadest of terms--may we expect to find?

The seminal questions which apply to all the types of source, though not to all in the same way, are these: what has Shakespeare omitted from the source? What has he selected? What has he altered? What has he added? Once more these are not always separable, for some omissions are like alterations and some alterations have almost the effect of additions. But this fourfold scheme of comparison of the plays with their sources can give us illuminating perspectives on single works, and, whenever a pattern emerges over several works, pointers to more general aspects of Shakespearean composition.

Applied to main and subsidiary story-sources the procedure is preeminently fruitful. While it would be absurd, in conducting one's comparisons, to find every single act of omission significant, or to catalogue the multitudinous acts of addition, a judicious use of the procedure can unmask new points, even at this late stage of source-comparison. More important it can take us by a short road to assessment of Shakespeare's achievement. For instance one regularly has to admire the economy and clarity with which Shakespeare gets his action under way, every time we compare the usually laborious exposition of his originals. The sure instinct to perceive and exploit what is most dramatic in a story-source also becomes manifest, most of all where he selects little else but what is most dramatic. His flair for combining disparate materials is also evident.

Applied to story-traditions the procedure again yields dividends, and not only for plays where we do not know of precise story-source texts; for in tracing the different forms of the underlying story, we discern its staying power, its appeal, its possibilities of development, perhaps in more directions than one. It is of value to compare Shakespeare's response to the opportunities and problems of a tradition with that of other authors, and this is true even though he will not have known all the variations of a story which scholarship has now amassed.¹

¹The most useful compilation is J.C. Dunlop, History of Prose Fiction, 3 vols., Edinburgh, 1814. I have used the fourth edn., rev. in 2 vols. by H. Wilson, London, 1838. Further help can be forthcoming from Stith Thompson, Motif-Index of Folk Literature, 6 vols., Bloomington, Indiana, 1955 (revised edn.). The possibility cannot be overlooked that Shakespeare knew of variations that scholarship has not recovered.

Genre of course tends not to involve such comparison of text with text: its influence is more pervasive but less definable. There are however well-recognized features of genres like romance or pastoral, which may be found in the comedies. Because they do so with greater or less regularity, it becomes pertinent at times to ask why they appear when they do; and occasionally to ask why they do not appear when for some reason they might have been expected to. Here too is a pattern of omission, selection, change and addition.

Similar opportunities and hazards await the scrutiny of his earlier work as source. Though not every omission or repetition can be significant, some may be, and it may be possible to find a pattern. Yet other hazards are peculiar to this type of source: clearly it cannot be invoked for plays so early as to have no predecessors, and can be invoked only with great caution where the chronological order of the plays remains conjectural. Yet new and perhaps valuable insights may emerge, as in the case of Twelfth Night alluded to earlier, and it seems right at least to attempt the construction of a pattern of development by means of this category of source. Here too we may find free use and creative divergence.

Such then are the kinds of source and the recurrent questions which seem most useful for the source-study that has been desiderated. It remains to indicate the view taken of the chronology of our comedies; to declare the consensus that exists on the factual question, which story-sources did Shakespeare use, and where I go beyond this consensus

to support my view; and to state and justify some limitations in coverage.

It is normal to accept the order proposed for all the plays by E.K. Chambers,¹ and certainly the departure from that order of H.B. Charlton² stands as a bizarre warning. On the other hand the amount of incontestable evidence, external or internal, is severely limited for our group of comedies, and Chambers freely admits that no attempt to order them can escape circularity of reasoning:

This is inevitable, once we depart from the external evidence. The chronology can only become a complex hypothesis, pieced together from materials not in themselves conclusive, and depending for its acceptance on the success with which it combines convergent and reconciles conflicting probabilities. (I.252)

Not one of our group of plays has a known date of first performance and fewer of them can be assigned an initial date than can be assigned a terminal date. There is however one lifeline, the passage from Francis Meres' Palladis Tamia, published in 1598:

As the soule of Euphorbus was thought to liue in Pythagoras: so the sweete wittie soule of Ouid liues in mellifluous & hony-tongued Shakespeare, witnes his Venus and Adonis, his Lucrece, his sugred sonnets among his priuate friends, &c.

As Plautus and Seneca are accounted the best for Comedy and Tragedy among the Latines: so Shakespeare among the English is the most excellent in both kinds for the stage; for Comedy, witnes his Gentlemen of Verona, his Errors, his Love labors lost, his Love labours wonne, his Midsummers night dreame, & his Merchant of Venice... (Chambers, II.194)

¹William Shakespeare. A Study of Facts and Problems, 2 vols., Oxford, 1930, I.243-274.

²In Shakespearian Comedy, 1938.

If we may assume that Meres' enumeration is exhaustive, we can distinguish two groups of comedies: those named here, datable before 1599 or more probably 1598, and those not named, datable to 1598 or later. Such a finding is in harmony with the evidence for initial and terminal dates (listed by Chambers, I.246-249). But is Meres being exhaustive? He is not, in the case of the histories, yet for the tragedies and the poems he is. For the comedies he adds confusion by naming Love labours wonne, because no extant comedy¹ bears such a title. Various candidates have been proposed, including Much Ado, The Taming of the Shrew, The Taming of a Shrew and a lost early version of All's Well That Ends Well.² Of these I feel that The Shrew is likeliest for various reasons.³ Much Ado has not much to do with labours of love; its terminal date is as late as 1600; and stylistically it belongs with As You Like It and Twelfth Night (but here circularity of argument appears). A Shrew stands in problematic relationship with The Shrew (see below), but as its text stands it seems un-Shakespearean and there is little point in explaining one conundrum by linking it with another. That there was an early version of All's Well, now lost, is nothing but an assumption,⁴ perhaps made precisely to solve the present quandary.

¹ Meres' is not the only contemporary reference to a play with the title Love's Labour's Won, as has been shown by T.W. Baldwin in Shakespeare's Love's Labor's Won. New Evidence from the Account Books of an Elizabethan Bookseller, Carbondale, Illinois, 1957; yet it remains unidentified with any extant play.

² Others are listed by Chambers, I.272.

³ Some but not all set out by Chambers.

⁴ Chambers, I.273.

In favour of The Shrew there are only the following general considerations. First and strongest, there is little against it.¹ The subject-matter suits the title "Loue labours wonne", whether Petruchio's or Lucentio's story be in point. There are no references before 1598 to the play, but it was early confused with A Shrew, to which there are references, as early as 1594 and 1596.² Stylistically The Shrew is universally considered early. The conclusion therefore would be that The Shrew may be Love's Labour's Won, and if so Meres' list would seem to be exhaustive--given that Much Ado, As You Like It, Twelfth Night and Merry Wives are reasonably held to postdate Meres' passage. Against the identification are at least two main considerations. First, the title "Love's Labour's Won" has less point than the alliterative "Love's Labour's Lost", so that the latter title will surely have been the earlier of the two, whereas internal reasons make many scholars nowadays place The Shrew before Love's Labour's Lost; and though an older view was that Love's Labour's Lost was a very early play, I cannot myself agree with that view, for not only is its verse more accomplished than that of other comedies before A Dream, but the allusion to the School of Night (IV.iii.251)³ suggests a date after Chapman's Shadow of Night (1594). Secondly we cannot be sure that we possess all Shakespeare's works, in which case Love's Labour's Won could

¹Cf. Chambers I.326, the "method of exclusions".

²Chambers, I.322. The 1594 references are to the entry in S.R., and to Q1 itself.

³References to the text of Shakespeare are to the Tudor edn., William Shakespeare. The Complete Works, ed. P. Alexander, 1951.

after all be what it seems, a lost play of his. Obviously then we can only say that The Shrew may be the play Meres mentions, and the list may after all be exhaustive. At all events the comedies can be divided with reasonable confidence into two groups: one earlier, corresponding largely if not totally to Meres' list, one later. There would be six comedies in the earlier group, four in the later.

A further division can be made, within the group of six, with like confidence. A Dream has generally seemed more mature than Errors, The Two Gentlemen and The Shrew, and probably than Love's Labour's Lost:¹ for instance its burlesque play-within-the-play improves on that of Love's Labour's Lost. It is likely too that the bad weather described in A Dream II.i owes something to the weather of 1594, from March onwards, and a date of late 1594 or even 1595 would tend to support the argument from the play's increased maturity. The Merchant too contains what seem to be topical allusions, and may therefore give us a terminus post quem: a possible reference to the execution of Dr. Lopez (June 1594) at IV.i.134, and another to the capture of the Spanish ship St. Andrew in 1596 at I.i.27.² While the first allusion does not enable us to infer whether The Merchant or A Dream is the later, the second suggests that The Merchant is; and this view is in harmony with inferences based on the further maturing of style in The Merchant, notably in the strikingly individual idiom of Shylock. It therefore seems justifiable to conclude—at least until concrete new evidence

¹ Though Bullough for instance thinks otherwise, placing MND before, not after, LLL in his first volume.

² See J.R. Brown, ed. New Arden MV, 1955, Introdn., pp.xxv-xxvii.

is forthcoming—that the grouping of comedies indicated by Meres' list can be divided into two smaller groups: one consists of four early comedies, Errors, Love's Labour's Lost, The Shrew and The Two Gentlemen, the other of two slightly later comedies, A Dream and The Merchant. Within the earlier group it is hardly possible to consider one play earlier than another,¹ but for the later two we can say that A Dream probably precedes The Merchant.

Outside Meres' list matters are somewhat simpler. The presence of Kempe in the cast of Much Ado and his departure from the company in 1599² entail that that play can be no later than 1599, while its absence from Meres' list suggests that it does not predate 1598. The altered type of role for the fool in As You Like It and Twelfth Night is compatible with, and may independently suggest, a change of actor—the change in fact from Kempe to Armin. Now this inference harmonizes with the terminal date of 1600 for As You Like It and the initial date of the same year for Twelfth Night, supplied by external evidence,³ and stylistic criteria tend to confirm the ordering, Much Ado, As You Like It, Twelfth Night. The Merry Wives on the other hand has been dated both after and before the other three.⁴ To summarize then, I conceive of three groups of comedies, in the later two of which can be discerned an order for most individual plays. The groups are: 1) Errors, Love's

¹There are some indications (mentioned above) that LLL may be latest of the four, and such a conclusion would be acceptable as making LLL immediately precede MND. Otherwise there is no reason to qualify R.A. Foakes' remark that "it seems...impossible to decide in what order Shakespeare's first four comedies were written...", New Arden CE, 1962, Introd., p.xxiii.

²Chambers, I.387, cf.79.

³Ibid. I.248-249.

⁴Ibid. I.270 and Bullough, II.3-4 respectively.

Labour's Lost, The Shrew, The Two Gentlemen; 2) A Dream, The Merchant; 3) Much Ado, As You Like It, The Merry Wives, Twelfth Night. Within the groups the following order is adopted: Group 1, no order; Group 2, A Dream then The Merchant; Group 3, Much Ado then As You Like It then Twelfth Night, with the position of Merry Wives uncertain.

At several points in the statement of our underlying chronology for the comedies we have had to admit the necessity of inconclusiveness, and a similar inconclusiveness has often to be accepted in the course of considering what were the sources of the chosen comedies. In the ensuing discussion the order of mention is alphabetical for the early group, but for the later two groups follows the outlined chronology.

The sources of Errors at least are fairly clear. The story of the twins derives from the Menaechmi of Plautus, perhaps with elements from the Amphitruo as well. The subsidiary story of Egeon and Emilia is added from the popular story of Apollonius of Tyre. In addition the setting (Ephesus), with the themes of witchcraft and family relationship, owes something to what Shakespeare knew of Ephesus from the Bible (Acts and Ephesians). So much is clear, but it is harder to be sure which versions he used. Menaechmi was not available in published translation until 1595, by which time Errors had been performed at least once. Could Shakespeare have seen the translation of W.W. (usually taken to be William Warner) in manuscript form? Since verbal correspondences do not require this

supposition,¹ and there is no good reason to doubt that he could read Latin, the onus of proof surely rests on those who favour his use of W.W.'s English version. The story of Apollonius was told at length in the Gesta Romanorum, appeared also in the Confessio Amantis of John Gower (Book VIII), and more recently in The Pattern of Painful Adventures by Laurence Twine.² It is impossible, and perhaps unimportant, to decide which version Shakespeare was recalling. The same is true of his use of the New Testament, for he seems to have had both the Bishops' Bible (1568) and the Geneva version (1560) at recall.³

Love's Labour's Lost and The Shrew present a more obscure picture. For the former no particular written sources have yet been discovered. Names and some other details probably come from contemporary French history, and the masque of Muscovites owes something to the Gray's Inn revels of 1594/5, at which Errors

¹The list of suggested correspondences is relatively short, but interesting; cf. New Arden CE, ed. R.A. Foakes, Introdn., pp.xxv-xxvi. Foakes' conclusion however is cautious, that they do not amount to convincing evidence that Shakespeare knew W.W.'s translation: indeed the parallels may mean that the translation echoed CE (a position which chronological arguments would support). If Shakespeare knew a Latin text of Menaechmi, it might have been that of Iambinus, as is claimed by T.W. Baldwin, Five-Act Structure, pp.667-681, 688-694 and Foakes, *ibid.*, p.xxviii. But one's broad impression is that Shakespeare's debt to Menaechmi was not at the level of verbal borrowing.

²The story is No. CLIII, "Of Temporal Tribulation", in the translation of the Gesta by C. Swan, revised by W. Hooper, 1876 (pp.259-299). Twine's book was registered in 1576, and survives in edns. of c.1594 and 1607 (see New Arden CE, p.xxxi, n.2). Other versions of the story, less likely to have come Shakespeare's way, are discussed by Dunlop, I.82-85, 327-and 446.

³New Arden CE, p.113.

was performed;¹ but no literary source has been found for the main story. Since however it is a play of wit more than action perhaps we need not be surprised. The Shrew is confusing for different reasons. In 1594 appeared the first Quarto edition of "A Pleasant Conceited Historie, called The taming of a Shrew...." Our play is usually dated to 1594 or 1593, but the reasoning is partly circular. Nobody knows whether The Shrew is earlier or later than A Shrew; whether A Shrew, if it is later, is a "bad Quarto"; whether both plays derive from a lost older play; whether Shakespeare had any hand in A Shrew, or in a putative lost play. In such a situation it is impossible to compare texts and see what Shakespeare does with inherited materials. For the same reason it is hard to make much out of the descent of both plays from Gascoigne's Supposes, itself a translation of Ariosto's play I Suppositi. The double disguise plot of Lucentio and Bianca probably goes back to Gascoigne, but who can say if Shakespeare or another thought of combining it with the fabliau humour of The Shrew and the rustic humour of Sly's ennoblement? In the present state of our knowledge therefore critical source-study of The Shrew is chimerical.

The Two Gentlemen draws material from three traditions. The relations of Proteus, Julia and Silvia are generally agreed to derive from those of Felix, Felismena and Celia in Diana of Jorge de Montemayor, while those of the two friends who love the same woman stand in a long tradition of friendship stories, and there are elements also of Arthur Brooke's long poem, The Tragical History of Romeus and Juliet (1562). But as with Errors it is difficult to be sure which versions Shakespeare knew. Diana was first pub-

¹ Bullough, I.426-433.

lished in 1559, and a French translation appeared in 1578.¹ The first published English translation was that of Bartholomew Yong (1598) but there were other translations and a lost play performed in 1585, The History of Felix and Philomena.² Among this abundance of versions, Yong's is usually chosen, for two reasons. Firstly, although it was not published till after the first performance of Shakespeare's play it had been finished for sixteen years or more according to Yong's statement (Kennedy, p.5). He also says that the copy sent to the printer was "verie dark and enterlined" (p.7), which could be the result of circulation in manuscript among friends. So Shakespeare could have seen a manuscript, perhaps in the library of a wealthy friend or patron. Secondly, we have the verbal correspondences between Yong and the play. These are virtually conclusive, especially as a few new suggestions can be made (below, Chap. 3). For the present it must suffice to instance the recurrence of Yong's words "minion" and "modesty" in I.ii, and also the phrase "making the matter strange" (p.83, line 32). These correspondences and others make it reasonable to conclude that Shakespeare read Yong--unless there is strong evidence for other versions. Even if there were such evidence it would be open to us to suppose that he knew more than one version; but a lost play, whose title alone survives and then with "philiomena" not "felismena", is not a strong rival to Yong. We do not know enough about other English versions to say if they included the tale of Felismena, or if Shakespeare could have seen them, and seen them early enough for them to have

¹Bullough, I.206, J.M. Kennedy, A Critical Edition of Yong's Translation of George of Montemayor's Diana and Gil Polo's Enamoured Diana, Oxford, 1968, p.422 (referred to hereafter as "Kennedy"),

²Kennedy, p.xxxiii; E.K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, 4 vols., Oxford, 1923, II.106, IV.101, 160.

preceded his writing of The Two Gentlemen.¹ The usual verdict in Yong's favour therefore seems well grounded. The position with the Friends story is less clear. The story of Titus and Gisippus was told by Boccaccio, Elyot and others, but although Shakespeare probably knew it his play ends differently. Lyly's Euphues. The Anatomy of Wit is of the same kindred but ends differently from Boccaccio, his followers and Shakespeare. What we have is not different versions of a single story but different members of a story-tradition; but so understood, the story may be very illuminating.

A Dream shows a range of debts that is dazzling. For the first time we may include Shakespeare's own earlier work because the quarrel of two friends over one woman while a second woman, betrayed by one of them, looks on, is close to the situation in The Two Gentlemen. Yet not only are there other sources for other parts of the play: this situation itself may have other sources. In Chaucer's Knight's Tale the wedding of Theseus and Ipolita provides a framing story, as it does in A Dream; and the story which it frames, of the rivalry of Palamon and Arcite for the hand of "Emelye the brighte", which ends in the death of Arcite, has points of correspondence with the story of Lysander and Demetrius, though they are less clear-cut than the correspondences between the frame-plots. Since the story existed in other versions, some of which could have been known to Shakespeare, it is perhaps too seldom debated whether Chaucer's was necessarily the version which inspired A Dream: neither Muir nor Bullough spend time on proof.²

¹Kennedy, pp.xxxi-xxxiii.

²Muir, I.31 and Bullough, I.368.

There are verbal parallels, such as the name "Philostrate", which is found in the two texts but not in the Teseide which underlies Chaucer,¹ and other parallels may be drawn. Notwithstanding these points Shakespeare's ending, tone and total design are different from Chaucer's, and his play owes something to the character of Theseus in North's Plutarch. Hence it could be misleading to call Chaucer his "main story-source", and there are advantages in treating rather of the story-tradition. Pyramus and Thisbe probably came to Shakespeare from Ovid's Metamorphoses (Book IV), translated by Golding, and Ovid contributed other mythological materials. Other elements in this sophisticated combination elude precise identification. Oberon could be from Froissart or from Greene's James IV. The puck might be from books of fairy lore, but could as well be from folklore itself. Similarly with the other fairies, and the ass's head: folklore or literary sources may have helped Shakespeare, but no precise debt is clear. The sources of A Dream are therefore numerous, allusive and difficult to discuss in terms of main and subsidiary story-sources: with this play indeed it is equally pertinent to consider the genres and Shakespeare's own earlier work as sources.

With The Merchant on the other hand, though it too combines several sources in varying degrees, the position is clearer, since the main story-source is known, and Shakespeare follows it as closely as he does for any comedy so far mentioned. It is found in II Pedorone (Story One, Day Four), a collection of novelle in the manner

¹Bullough, I.369, and cf. S. Fender, Shakespeare. A Midsummer Night's Dream, 1968. Also F. Sidgwick, ed. The Sources and Analogues of MND, 1908, in his Introduction.

of the Decameron made by Ser Giovanni Fiorentino.¹ One cannot be quite so certain regarding the version known to Shakespeare. For one thing there was no English version at this time, for another he may have used an old play called The Jew, of which only a description by Stephen Gosson remains. Nevertheless as he used Italian stories, not Englished as far as we know, for other plays (Othello, Cymbeline), and as Italian words appear in The Shrew, we need not hesitate to accept that he could read Italian: then why not Il Pecorone? As for the lost play Gosson's description² is admittedly not unlike aspects of The Merchant. But "the greedinesse of worldly chusers, and bloody mindes of Usurers" does not have to mean a dual plot, combining the Bond and the Caskets, for the "chusers" and the "Usurers" may be one and the same group.³ The Jew may not even concern a Flesh-Bond, and in any case to discuss it at length is absurd while it does not exist. It is not absurd to scrutinize the Italian text until an English intermediary is found, and to be grateful that a text so readily comparable with a Shakespeare text is open to our inspection. Subsidiary material was drawn for the Caskets plot from a story in the Gesta Romanorum, probably in the translation of R. Robinson since the rare word "insculpt" appears in both texts;⁴ and from Marlowe's The Jew of Malta, as well as other sources. In spite of these near-certain attributions it is also valuable to study the story-traditions, for the Bond, the Caskets, and the Jew's Daughter are all stories with a venerable and illuminating ancestry.

¹He made his collection in the late fourteenth century, but its earliest printing is in 1558 (Milan).

²From his Schools of Abuse (1579), cf. Bullough, I.445-446.

³Cf. New Arden MV, ed. J.R. Brown, Introdn., p.xxx, for these and other arguments.

⁴Cf. New Arden MV, pp.xxxii, 173.

Much Ado shows somewhat similar relationships. The story of Claudio and Hero corresponds most with Bandello's tale of Timbreo and Fenicia,¹ but whether in the Italian, in Belleforest's expanded French translation, or in a lost English translation one cannot say. There was also a lost play of 1574 known as "Panecia".² The lost-play hypothesis seems more flimsy than usual in the present case, and again there is no necessity to postulate an English translation. But since some details of Much Ado seem to recall both Bandello and Belleforest,³ we should perhaps think more in terms of story-tradition; and there is the more reason to do so because the play also shows affinities with Ariosto's earlier variant of the tale, in Book V of the Orlando Furioso. These and other variations are traced with admirable precision in C.T. Prouty's book on the play's sources. Combined with the story of Hero are the story of Beatrice and Benedick, and the misadventures of Dogberry. Though affinities have been discerned for these, they are too general to be of much value: Shakespeare probably invented their essential features.

As You Like It has blessedly simple source-relationships, for Lodge's Rosalynde is the only major debt. The only uncertainty about it is marginal: which edition did Shakespeare use? The original edition of 1590 was followed by another in 1592, and others that might have been available to him. It seems impossible to decide which one he

¹ La Prima Parte de le Novelle del Bandello, Lucca, 1554, Novella 22.

² E.K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, Oxford, II.88, and IV.149.

³ E.g. Don John recalls Belleforest's villain more than Bandello's (cf. Bullough, II.65-66), but the Italianate names suggest Bandello more than his translator.

used, and the question is probably not important for most purposes.

Twelfth Night is more complicated again. Shakespeare most probably used Barnabe Riche's story "Of Apolonius and Silla", published in Riche's Farewell to Military Profession (1581), for there is significant verbal correspondence;¹ but though Riche was his major story-source the debt was not very great. Twelfth Night is a case where it is equally profitable to discuss the whole story-tradition, because the adventures of Viola and Sebastian have literally dozens of predecessors and counterparts, in five or six European languages. Plautus' Menaechmi, in which the twins are both male, fascinated Renaissance audiences, and by 1531 a variation had been created in which one twin is female. After Gl'Ingannati (acted 1531, published 1537) came translations and adaptations, among them a novella by Bandello (II.36, 1554); a translation of that by Belleforest (Histoires Tragiques, IV.59); Gl'Inganni, a play by Nicolò Secchi (1562); another Gl'Inganni by Curzio Gonzaga (1592); Laelia, a Latin version acted at Cambridge in 1595; and Riche's version. In addition Montemayor's tale of Felismena, and Shakespeare's own Errors and Two Gentlemen are connected with the tradition. It is not likely that he knew all these, but probable that he knew quite a number of them. Rather than conduct intricate but sterile argument about which versions shall count as sources it seems best to treat Riche as major source but to give prominence to a study of development within this whole tradition. Subsidiary sources have sometimes

¹Cf. Muir, Shakespeare's Sources, I.70-71, and below, Chapter 10.

been suggested for the character of Malvolio and the trick played upon him. They have however usually been topical events rather than literary sources, and as such, apart from their lack of real cogency, fall outside the scope of this study.

The Merry Wives again has numerous, elusive sources. Since it includes a Falstaff it must owe something to Shakespeare's own histories, although this Falstaff is by no means identical with his namesake of the Henry IV plays. The tricking of Falstaff is related to two types of story: one concerning a duped husband, of which Il Pecorone, Straparola and Tarleton's News out of Purgatory provide examples, and the other concerning a duped lover, of which another story of Straparola and its translation in Painter's Palace of Pleasure provide examples. The wooing of Anne Page is in a tradition going back to the Casina of Plautus, but contemporary plays like The Shoemaker's Holiday of Dekker are in the same area. The horse-stealing episodes on the other hand are probably based on topical events. The fairies owe something to Ovid (the story of Actaeon), something to the fairies of Lyly's Endimion, something to folk belief and something to A Dream. The source-relationships of The Merry Wives are in fact so diversified and indefinite that they recall A Dream.

The source-relationships of the ten comedies, as outlined above, partly determine the scope and coverage of the source-study we are undertaking. Positively there should be ample

opportunity for source-comparisons, in detail and in depth, where there is general agreement as to the identity of the written sources: accordingly the treatment of As You Like It, Errors, The Merchant, Much Ado, Twelfth Night and The Two Gentlemen can be full and systematic in comparisons. Negatively where no main story-source is known, or where there is not general agreement as to the source-relationships of a play, the study cannot be full or systematic: accordingly it will hardly be profitable to devote much space to Love's Labour's Lost while we know of no written source-stories for the play, or to The Shrew while its pedigree is so radically disputed. With the remaining two plays, A Dream and The Merry Wives, the position is different. A Dream stands in some relation to The Knight's Tale, yet the relation is not a particularly close one; nor, though the play stands also in the same story-tradition as Chaucer's story, is that tradition more than fitfully illuminating. On the other hand a debt to his own earlier work is apparent in A Dream, this being the earliest comedy where we can be fairly sure of the identity of its predecessors; and the play's relations with the genres have an interest almost equal to that of the rather nebulous story-traditions. So although it is regrettable that the desired primacy and clarity of story-sources is lacking in the case of A Dream, and systematic treatment is therefore impossible, the opportunity may be taken to make points of substance concerning self-borrowing and genre, if in a more limited way, as partial com-

pensation. With The Merry Wives the position is different again, for three reasons. In the first place the play has always seemed an exception to one's sense of what is usual, or normal, in a comedy of Shakespeare because its generic affiliations are so clearly with fabliau and intrigue more than with romance. In the second place, though, this play, like A Dream, shows kinship with story-traditions rather than with known particular versions, even the story-traditions are elusive, since Shakespeare combines elements from several of them with great freedom and in addition gives considerable scope to his own invention. Finally of course the play reemploys characters who had proved their worth in the Henry IV plays, so that Shakespeare's use of his own earlier work is here unusually manifest.

The shape of the ensuing discussion of our chosen group of comedies is determined by all these vagaries of dating and source-relationship, as follows. Six plays admit of a thorough-going critical source-study and a chapter is accordingly devoted to each of them. They are The Two Gentlemen, Errors, The Merchant, Much Ado, As You Like It and Twelfth Night. Three plays, whose source-relationships are too undecided for critical source-study to have much value, are considered more briefly in a single chapter--The Shrew, Love's Labour's Lost and A Dream. For the remaining comedy, The Merry Wives, the absence of specific story-sources prevents detailed comparison of texts; but its distinctive, indeed peculiar source-relationships make it no less relevant to the present study, and

accordingly it is given a chapter to itself. There is also a brief concluding chapter.

On the other hand, notwithstanding the necessary diversity of approach occasioned by the very different source-relationships, there is one influence which is present in all the comedies and which no account of their genesis should overlook. The influence in question is a generic one, that of romance. Its typical motifs and elements are often an integral, and at times a controlling, part of the comedies, and even The Merry Wives is not devoid of its influence. It seems appropriate therefore to include the type-situations of romance, and to some extent its more impalpable ambience of ideas, among Shakespeare's sources. But before one can discuss romance influence upon any particular play some consideration should be given to the genre as a whole.

CHAPTER TWO

THE GENRE OF ROMANCE.

Romance, like other literary kinds, had type-situations, conventions and attitudes to life of its own, of which a well-read man like Shakespeare would be aware and could make use. Since the question what aspects might best suit his comic purposes¹ is the concern of the present chapter, it cannot attempt a balanced survey of the romance tradition: it is a sketch only, selecting and schematizing what will afford the needed perspective upon the comedies. After some characteristic interests of the genre have been stated, an account is given of changes in their treatment up to and including the sixteenth century, with possible reasons for those changes. Shakespeare's own use of recurring aspects of romance--his contribution to its continuing development--will often be implicit, sometimes explicit, although more detailed discussion of his use of genre is reserved for subsequent chapters.

The chief elements of romance are described as follows by H.F. Brooks, apropos of Errors:

The leading interests of romance--as one might exemplify from Arthurian romances, from The Squire's Tale, or, coming to the period of our play, from the romance aspects of Arcadia and The Faerie Queene--were adventure; marvel, especially enchantment; the high sentiment of love; and sens, the implications brought out in the matière, the meaning the reader takes away with him, as a result of the author's treatment.²

¹Of course he used romance materials for tragedy, e.g. RJ or Othello, but the tragic possibilities are not our concern.

²"Themes and Structure in The Comedy of Errors", in Stratford-upon-Avon Studies, Vol. III, 1961, Early Shakespeare, p.64.

In what follows we observe Brooks' distinction of four main elements: 1) adventure 2) marvel 3) love 4) sens.

At times however the distinction is a little too sharp or succinct. Certainly all four leading interests are present in Shakespeare's comedies; but they are often harder to distinguish from one another than a bald classification may suggest. More important, the elements occur at other times in specific variations that are equally traditional to romance. Thus the adventures of romance often include hazardous journeys and--normally as a result--disguise, and marvels are likely to be related to the setting of a romance, the countries to which or through which the hazardous journey is made. These variations should to some extent be discussed separately from the main elements of which they are part.

Love in romance is especially liable to be present in variations that are among the plainest conventions of the genre: love at first sight; a lover's initial resistance to love; his surrender; his attempts at secrecy and the marks of love he reveals unawares; his humility, courtesy, and dejection; his verse-writing and the religious imagery he uses to describe or address his lady--all were available to Shakespeare. They have however been catalogued before, for example by E.C. Pettet,¹ and are in any event less important for our purposes than other

¹Shakespeare and the Romance Tradition, 1949, Cap.1. Cf. C.S. Lewis, The Allegory of Love, Oxford, 1936, passim, and H.J.C. Grierson, Cross Currents in English Literature of the Seventeenth Century, 1929, Cap.2.

considerations. These include the manner in which love-interest affects the treatment of other romance elements,¹ the personality of the heroine, and the motif of the heroine in disguise, for such considerations determine how Shakespeare uses the more obviously conventional forms, like love at first sight.

Sens, the least self-explanatory element, needs some elucidation. As Brooks uses the term sens is not present in romance in the same way as the other elements, because it is not a source of incident. Rather it is their final cause, that for which they exist. Brooks himself says, "To consider the sens is to consider the themes....the general ideas arising most naturally from the motives and development of the plot, and the response of the characters" (p.66). While an equation of sens with "theme" might sometimes be too narrow, the mention of "general ideas" is useful. I shall use sens in the slightly wider sense still, based on Brooks' earlier definition, of the implication of the *matière*; that which a romance treats most seriously; its seriousness. It must be admitted of course that sens describes an area where many, if not most, critical disagreements occur.

While adventure, marvel, love and sens are found in most romances, they occur in varying proportions, and it is by

¹ In other words my discussion of romance tries to avoid exclusive concern with romantic love in the comedies, while admitting its primacy, whereas some discussions of the comedies which are valuable because they do take romance seriously nevertheless limit themselves too much to its love interests (cf. Pettet, and P.G. Phialas, Shakespeare's Romantic Comedies, Chapel Hill, 1966, p.xi).

such variations of balance that romance has developed. Broadly speaking¹ one finds an early² emphasis upon the first two elements, followed by a movement away from them towards love and sens, which itself involves changes within the prevailing conception of the latter two elements. A shift of emphasis from actions to feelings and thoughts is what we should expect. The overt, visible action of adventure and marvel makes a strong appeal at first; then as the audience of romance acquire more sophistication action by itself becomes repetitive and monotonous to them; a new demand is created, for mental as well as physical incident; and eventually feeling without action becomes a possibility.³ The question what happened has become overshadowed by the question how and why it happened.

This development, which occurred over a period of centuries with narrative romance,⁴ occurred within a shorter span in the case of dramatized romance. Much of medieval drama was sacred rather than secular, and when drama did launch into secular subjects, preeminently in Italy, they were usually classical. This fact did not have to preclude romantic treatment, since

¹ Since the corpus of romances was composed over many centuries and in several languages, there are bound to be exceptions to this statement. Some early romances show particular interest in love or sens, and later romances often preserve the older predominance of adventures. Nevertheless the broad tendency seems undeniable.

² "Early" and "late" are points on a time-scale running from the end of classical antiquity to the death of Shakespeare. Greek and Latin romances, whether epic or pastoral, heroic or sentimental, early or late, are excluded from consideration, though they might show a similar line of development.

³ The novel has on the whole followed a similar path.

⁴ The change from poetry to prose as the usual form of romance does not affect the point.

Renaissance dramatists often viewed classical stories in a more romantic light than the Plautus and Terence they were imitating.¹ Yet the resulting plays were only partly romances. In England on the other hand sacred drama, in the form of the mystery plays or moralities, held sway longer and classical models did not achieve the same predominance as in Italy or France. For some reason, probably unfathomable, when English drama came into its own several models were available, no one being preponderant. As a result dramatists could be, and were, eclectic: classical drama (in a Latin or Italian rather than Greek form) took its chance along with romance, novelle, national legend, pageantry, fooling and the rest. So much is clear from Stephen Gosson's withering account of contemporary dramatists' materials: "...the Palace of Pleasure, the Golden Ass, the Aethiopian History, Amadis of France, the Round Table, bawdy comedies in Latin, French, Italian and Spanish, have been thoroughly ransacked to furnish the play-houses in London."² The impression conveyed is that romances were the more important source and influence. Doubtless these materials suited the taste of the audiences, already familiar with naive narrative romance; but taste altered very rapidly to include more sophisticated interpretations of romance, like those of Lyly. Within twenty years dramatized romance completed a

¹ Brooks, *ibid.*, p.64 and M. Doran, Endeavors of Art, *passim*: also H.B. Charlton, Shakespearian Comedy, pp.22-23, re Ariosto in this context. Cf. below, Cap.4, re Errors.

² Plays Confuted in Five Actions, (1582), quoted by Pettet, p.35.

cycle of fashion which narrative romance had completed only in centuries.

The dramatic versions are not necessarily better on this account than the narrative ones, but the rapidity of their evolution does pose the question, why overt action should yield to thought and feeling—in the drama, of all places. "Drama" means doing or deed, and so predisposes us to expect a good deal of action. Yet conceptions of what action may consist in appear to have changed during the swift flowering of the English drama towards the close of the sixteenth century: here too adventure and marvel gave ground to love and sens. But the giving ground was not simply a disappearance, rather a change of their quality: they could be assimilated by love and sens because they had partly become them. The process can best be traced if we consider the romance elements one by one.

The early predominance of adventure appears in the account of "romance" given in the Oxford English Dictionary. After the word's primary sense of the vernacular language of France (as opposed to Latin), we read:

II.2. A tale in verse, embodying the adventures of some hero of chivalry, esp. of those of the great cycles of medieval legend, and belonging both in matter and form to the ages of knight-hood; also, in later use, a prose tale of a similar character.

The ages of knighthood, in the sense of actual knights engaging in knightly combat within a context of feudal fealty, were dead before the sixteenth century. While they flourished knightly

romance also flourished. Yet since chivalric forms survived as an influence upon codes of manners and the demeanour of courts into the time of Sidney (and therefore Shakespeare), the demise of knightly societies by no means ended the taste for chivalric romances. Indeed the remoteness of such societies from Elizabethans might make them more, not less, suited to romance, as the popularity of Bevis, Palmerin and Amadis suggests.¹ But though chivalric romances may not have become fewer in number, they were probably losing ground proportionally. Adventures of other kinds were to be found in romance: piracy, battles undignified by chivalric forms, conspiracy and mercantile enterprise, as in many romantic novelle.² By the same token the protagonists of romance need not be knights, nor always of the ruling class. Moreover other varieties of romance were flourishing which depended less on any kind of adventures, notably the pastoral romance. Thus Montemayor's Diana, while it includes such adventures as the journeys of Felismena or a battle with wild men, is more concerned with the pastoral scene, its gods and nymphs and loves. In spite of continuities and revivals, therefore, narrative chivalric romances were declining in influence in Shakespeare's day, and soon the process was to be accelerated by the publication and European diffusion of Don Quixote.³

¹Cf. L.B. Wright, Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England, Chapel Hill, 1935, pp.375 ff.

²The subjects of these novelle are often much older stories, as the pages of Dunlop's History of Prose Fiction show. But since they retell other types of adventure more than chivalric ones the novelle effect and reflect the broad change we are sketching.

³Published 1605 (Part I) and 1615 (Part II). Trns. in English 1612-20, French 1614-18, and Italian 1622-5.

A basically similar development obtains for English dramatic romance. Texts of early Elizabethan romantic plays are few, though even so plays of chivalry are represented, by Clyomon and Clamydes (c.1570) and Common Conditions (1576 or earlier). But the titles of non-extant plays performed in the period 1570-80 suggest that many plays of knightly adventure were being written.¹ Such plays did not cease later, indeed they apparently maintained their appeal quite well, to judge by the fortunes of Mucedorus.² Yet the gifted dramatists who appear after 1585 have little use for wandering knights, or the wandering plots they seem to entail. They are not found in Greene's better romances, Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay, and James the Fourth, Peele in The Old Wives' Tale places them in an ironic framework, and Lyly seems to avoid them. Shakespeare too has little use for them, in the comedies between The Two Gentlemen and the consciously archaizing Pericles.

At least two reasons suggest themselves for the neglect of chivalric adventure. First, although battles and personal combats are suitable material for tragic and historical dramas, they are comparatively seldom found in comedies of Shakespeare or others. Deaths are of course contrary to the comic mood,³ and

¹F.P. Wilson, The English Drama 1485-1585, Oxford, 1969, p.120: e.g. Knight in the Burning Rock, Irish Knight, Herpetulus the Blue Knight and Perobia.

²Edns. in 1598, 1606, 1610 etc.

³Cf. The Knight of the Burning Pestle by Francis Beaumont (1613), V.iii, p.74 in the Everyman edn. of Beaumont and Fletcher by M.C. Bradbrook, 1962: "'Twill be very unfit he should die, sir, upon no occasion—and in a comedy too." This play is a useful guide to the subjects and style of the naive romances which it ridicules.

the more sophisticated comedy becomes the more physical violence too becomes muted. Second, the appeal of fighting on stage probably waned as soon as dramatists of verbal and poetic power supervened. The spectacular appeal of clashes of arms, always prone to become monotonous, could now be used selectively, subordinated to the clashes of wits and personalities. The greater interest in personality probably meant that the deaths in romantic comedy became even less frequent. It was one thing for the wicked Thrasellus in Clyomon to be briskly slain by the hero: the violent departure into death of a sensitive being might mar the geniality of comedy and, especially if the killing were done on stage, it would impugn the worth of any protagonist who did it.

Other forms of adventure could replace derring-do. Moral courage could replace physical courage, and many examples were available from the reservoir of romance itself. Apollonius' endurance of prolonged suffering, or the princess's wisdom in choosing between the gold, silver and lead caskets, or the pluck of Queen Dorothea fleeing the assassination countenanced by her own husband: these are examples of moral courage, found in romance and dramatized. It is no accident that many of these stories of moral courage, and the plays based upon them, centre upon women rather than men, because women must resort to wits and resolution when they face danger or distress. Amazonian heroines like Felismena or Clorinda are the exception which proves the rule: if successful they are unfeminine, if unsuccessful they are tragic, not comic.

Nor is it an accident that disguise is a popular motif in dramatic as in narrative romance. Disguise, for a character who possesses courage without strength, is an excellent means of escape from peril. Accordingly women often disguise themselves in romance, especially in dramatic versions. More often than not the disguise adopted is male costume, that of a boy or page. But though the initial reason for disguise is usually the freedom of peregrination which it gives a woman among predatory males, other freedoms result, and these are among the greatest opportunities offered to dramatists by the genre. Since however a disguise of sex is almost invariably connected with love, it is discussed more fully below apropos of love.

Adventures naturally make a romance exciting; but to that effect they may add wonder, and so begin to merge with our second romance element, the marvellous.¹ Early narrative romances made plentiful use of marvels. Sorcerers and magicians, hermits and holy men, supernatural beings such as spirits and fairies, ghosts, giants, monsters, philtres, poisons, miraculous cures and revivals--such are ubiquitous in for example Arthurian romance. But however crude, incredible or melodramatic they may seem, they continue to do good service in narrative romances of the sixteenth century. The fact that these include such sophisticated works as the Orlando Furioso and Arcadia suggests that naive elements in romance, as in pastoral, are not inherently objectionable. It

¹As elsewhere, two categories which it is useful to distinguish are actually a continuum, yet not all adventures are marvels nor vice versa.

depends whether they are a suitable vehicle of expression on any particular occasion and are adjusted to a particular medium.

Dramatic romances in English at first used marvels with alacrity and indeed their appeal is understandable. When a magician casts a spell, or a saint miraculously cures, the audience beholds a man act with power more than human. Beings who are not human at all but immortal or ethereal must also evoke wonder; and a similar value resides in giants, who are larger than humanity, and monsters, who are wilder and uglier. The value in question is that of the spectacular, which should be more impressive in the drama than in the written word. Superhuman beings can also be used to extricate the plot from tedium or other difficulties,¹ and much the same is true of the strange potions and poisons unknown to science.

Nevertheless the disadvantages of naive or excessive use of spectacle came to outweigh these advantages. In the first place marvels could be hard to stage. Stephen Gosson wrote scathingly of "the adventures of an amorous knight...encountering many a terrible monster made of brown paper..."² Clyomon provides an instance, for the terrible woman-eating monster is not directly shown on stage except after its death, when its head is impaled on the hero's sword: there can be nothing spectacular or marvellous about a beast that is unseen except for its obviously portable head. The marvellous must be truly awesome,

¹Cf. Doran, Endeavors of Art, p.308.

²Plays Confuted, cf. Doran, op.cit., p.95, and W. Creizenach, The English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare, 1916, p.17; also The Knight of the Burning Pestle, IV.1, p.55.

and not surfeit by repetition. A second objection is equally grave: there can be little prolonged interest in the actions of protagonists who are constantly overruled by magic. Superhuman power, by suspending normal cause-and-effect, may well prevent fully human motivation and responsibility within a story: these latter proved to have the more lasting interest in romantic comedy.¹

Shakespeare, never making too naive or liberal use of the superhuman and the subhuman, avoided these elementary pitfalls. But he by no means avoided marvels, indeed most of the ones mentioned can be found in his comedies.² Significantly perhaps divine agency, magicians and monsters are plainest in his last romances, in which a return to more primitive layers of romance is accompanied by great dramatic expertise, experiment and tact. In our group of comedies however the treatment is usually less sophisticated and the material less primitive. The chief exception of course is A Dream, whose fairies are seen and do to some extent interfere with the responsibility of humans. But the dwarfing is deliberate and controlled: the fairies represent a form of play, more festive than malicious. Their childlike irresponsibility hints that human life may possess a dignity they lack. In plays where the superhuman is less dainty and more majestic, it is usually more responsible and (crucially) unseen. A priest or an oracle is the most we see, even of its agents, and

¹Prospero is no exception, for he seldom uses magic to play spectacular tricks and never to eliminate human responsibility.

²But not giants. Children may be used to personate beings smaller than human, but stage giants are likely to prove crudely ridiculous.

a vaguer, less personal fortune or providence is more often found. Fortune is quite as traditional, even conventional, to romance as more overwhelming forms of the supernatural,¹ and since it lacks their disadvantages it is more suitable for drama.

The resources upon which Shakespeare draws to present the marvellous include two which are absent from early dramatic romance: the intelligence to use conventions without being dominated by them; and poetic power, by which to evoke the marvellous without stating it directly or presenting it physically. The latter gain is enormous. The marvellous and especially the divine are not the less efficacious for being hinted rather than seen, because what may be lost by obtuse manifestation gains mysteriousness by obliquity.

The use of setting is a case in point. Early narrative romances, in portraying the adventures of knights errant, had not one setting but many. Early dramatic romances like Clyomon followed suit, but there were difficulties. How were wandering romances to be organized? The different countries, the forest and sea and isles of Clyomon make up a bewildering jumble. The author lacks the poetic, and probably the theatrical, resources to convey any vivid sense of his many locations. Later dramatists like Lyly and Peele attempt less but achieve more. Lyly sometimes adheres to classical practice, defining place visibly by the houses where actions occur; but nothing evocative can result. In the dialogue of Gallathea and Love's Metamorphosis however he conveys

¹For fortune in Sidney's Arcadia see J.F. Danby, Poets on Fortune's Hill, 1952, pp.49 ff. (subsequently re-entitled Elizabethan and Jacobean Poets).

a sense of the "over-all woodland-pastoral background":¹ hence the setting evokes wonder and unifies his action. Peele in The Old Wives' Tale unifies his action by contrasts—not the contrasts of multiple setting, but a contrast of rustic reality in the frame-plot with the remote lands where Madge's romance is set. The country setting, being firmly realized, contains and braces the romance world. Places of essentially romantic value can coexist with places resembling the actual world. The point is seminal for an understanding of the whole genre, but its present significance is this: Shakespearean romance can use settings in which the remote and the real, the wonderful and the everyday could illuminate each other.²

Shakespeare did not in fact adhere to any one procedure. As Clifford Leech has shown³ his comedies include single, double and multiple settings. The last are the least numerous (The Two Gentlemen, All's Well, Pericles and Cymbeline) and perhaps since these are not the best-loved of the comedies one is entitled to judge these reversions towards the naive form of wandering romance less than successful. His comedies with a single setting, like Errors, Love's Labour's Lost, Much Ado or The Tempest, are much better organized, though in observing a unity of place

¹Doran, Endeavors of Art, pp.292-293. Her whole discussion of setting, *ibid.*, is most valuable.

²I cannot agree with those who simply stress the remoteness of romance landscapes, as if they were all equally remote or remoteness were their outstanding characteristic (see e.g. A. Nicoll, The Theory of Drama, 1931, p.215 or The Theatre and Dramatic Theory, 1962, pp.134 f.). A truer perspective is suggested by G. Beer, The Romance, 1970, who speaks of "a serene intermingling of the unexpected and the everyday" (p.10).

³In his New Arden edn. of TGV, 1969, Introduction, pp.lvi-lix.

like that of classical comedy they assimilate little of its mercantile realism. But it is possible to feel that comedies with a dual setting like A Dream, The Merchant or As You Like It succeed best in terms of unity and wonder. Something close to the essence of romance is celebrated whenever the faraway and the everyday are illuminatingly juxtaposed. Of course the capacity of the genre to evoke wonder by the use of setting is realized only because Shakespeare has poetic resources which his predecessors lacked: both kinds of resource are needed before he can write the lines

I know a bank where the wild thyme blows,
Where oxlips and the nodding violet grows...
(MND II.i.249 ff.)

and

...her sunny locks
Hang on her temples like a golden fleece,
Which makes her seat of Belmont Calchos' strand,
And many Jasons come in quest of her.
(MV I.i.169-172)

His eclecticism, his power to select and combine from different sources, is as plain in his settings as anywhere. But this power is partly the consequence of his using a genre which allowed him to move towards the remote or the everyday and to include what he needed of either. It gave him a point of vantage—a sort of middle-ground, between the incredible and the mundane, the wonderful and the blatant, from which to arouse a characteristic response that is simultaneously wonder and belief.

The balance of wonder with belief can be present in other elements of romance, and particularly in mature romance treatments

of love. The qualification "mature" is important, because romances had not always been much concerned with love, at least not the love of man and woman for each other. In the Chanson de Roland the hero's feeling for his betrothed, Alde, is insignificant compared with his feeling for Oliver and for France. "'Love', in our sense of the word," says C.S. Lewis,¹ "is as absent from the literature of the Dark Ages as from that of classical antiquity." The love-interest in heroic literature tends to be confined to the muscular adventures which heroes undergo for love's sake. The energetic pursuit of love is central, its sensibility not.

A change came about through the literature of courtly love. The male protagonist may still engage in combat for the sake of love, for he must prove himself, but he must also show sensibility. To woo, to plead, to weep is now a major part of the service his lady requires.² This shift of emphasis goes with a certain constriction of range. Since often the lady whom the lover serves is wedded wife to his feudal lord, either he serves without hope, or hopes to achieve adultery.³ A more

¹The Allegory of Love, p.9.

²Ibid., p.29, for Chretien's Lancelot. Perhaps this work is the first where a change from adventures towards feelings is clear.

³Scholars writing after Lewis have sometimes denied that courtly love was necessarily adulterous, cf. G. Mathew, "Marriage and Amour Courtois in Late Fourteenth-Century England", in Essays Presented to Charles Williams, ed. C.S. Lewis, Oxford, 1947, pp.128-135. R.S. Loomis, The Development of Arthurian Romance, 1963, p.189, says, "It may come as a surprise to learn that the majority of the French and English verse-romances assume that marriage is the goal of lovers, just as in any Victorian novel." Similarly, "though the amours of Tristan and Lancelot were the most celebrated...they are by no means the most typical." Nevertheless, whether courtly love was usually adulterous or not, it often was--more often than during the sixteenth century. The general development we are tracing is not much affected by this local absence of consensus.

lasting and valuable consequence however was the increased importance to romance of the lady. She is no longer merely the prize, without personality: she has become the object of complexities of male feeling. On the other hand while becoming an important presence she remains an influence offstage. Though there has been a shift from older romance, where the lady is a nonentity, waiting to be claimed by her knight when he has proved himself, male predominance has been inverted rather than overthrown. The point of view from which love is viewed is always masculine.

Out of the courtly love tradition comes a variant which moves a step nearer to Shakespeare's conception of love in romance, namely the kind of love-situation celebrated by Petrarch. The form is the sonnet or sonnet-sequence, the matter again unhappy love. The poet addresses a mistress who is characteristically unkind, cruel, full of disdain. But the situation is less likely to involve feudal or triangular relationships: the language of love is becoming more free and personal. Yet the point of view remains entirely masculine.

Eventually writers became equally interested in a situation where romance could explore the sensibility of successful love. The mistress is amenable, attainable, marriageable. Her relationship with a suitor can proceed through meeting, wooing, trials and tests, to wedlock. Now this development was especially useful to romantic drama, since for one thing such stories have more momentum than the anfractuositities of courtly

love, because they move to an appointed end, marriage. But though marriage makes a convenient stopping-place, its presence at the end of romantic comedy has more than a utilitarian value. Since marriage is one of the events which most affect people's happiness, it involves questions of human quality for individuals, of rapport between persons, and of accommodation to the society which ratifies marriage.¹ Society indeed is not involved only juridically, but by an instinctive festive approval of love's remoter goal--the procreation of new life after the primary goal of love's quest, marriage, has been achieved. This is presupposed as natural in romantic comedy, though it is not stressed, and so we find Rosalind thinking about her child long before she is sure of union with its intended father, and Olivia unequivocally bidden to leave a copy of herself.² In fact the self-knowledge of the one character and the self-ignorance of the other are virtually defined by their opposite reactions to the thought of progeny. Moreover the witnessing society may include the divine. In Shakespeare, as in Lyly, the divine and sacramental is often introduced; not in the form of the company of heaven, nor necessarily by apocalypse, but tactfully by means of priests, agents, nonscriptural or allegorical deities, and poetic suggestion.³ Where the goal has such

¹Cf. G.K. Hunter, John Lyly, p.323.

²AYL I.iii.11, TN I.v.225 ff. Hence also the lugubrious effect of Theseus' description to Hermia of lifelong virginity (MND I.i.65-78).

³Cf. above re the divine in mature romance. Priests in MA, TN; masque elements in AYL (Hymen); divinities in MND (the fairies) and Tempest (Juno, Ceres, Iris); poetic suggestion by itself in MV (V.i.54-91) but of course co-present elsewhere.



human and divine sanction the final response will naturally be that delighted wonder which romantic comedy elsewhere favours.

The ascendancy of happy love had other implications for comedy, chief among them being an interest in the heroine. She becomes a person in her own right, with her own point of view. It is perhaps possible to see why this should happen. If the hero in love was to be an interesting theme for romance, his love itself must be of interest; but if that was to be of interest, so must the lady towards whom it was directed, and so must her love for him. In which case the conventional disdainful mistress was almost as unhelpful as the tame undifferentiated ladies of non-courtly romance. A type of heroine was needed who combined feeling and presence, at which the courtly tradition pointed, with some capacity of loving in return, and even of taking initiatives to secure the rewards of love in marriage.

Such capacities were not unprecedented in non-courtly romance, and were found especially in the many tales which narrated the disguising of a heroine, for love's sake. Tales involving this motif had long been popular, Nicolette's quest for Aucassin being one example, and another being the story of Alessandro and the "abbot" (Decameron II.iii). But in the sixteenth century they became particularly common, whether we consider narrative examples like the tale of Felismena or dramatic ones like Gl'Ingannati and its progeny. English comedies seem especially addicted to the motif, which occurs in, for example, Clyomon, Promos and Cassandra,

James IV, Gallathea and four comedies of Shakespeare within our group.¹

In the case of Lyly, writing plays for boy actors only, part of the attraction of disguise is obvious, for the role of women is almost easier for boys to perform than male adult roles. Writers for the public stages where boys and adults acted together could exploit the same advantages without incurring most of the limitations. Yet although this mechanical reason should not be underestimated, we must concentrate rather on the intrinsic, literary advantages of the disguised heroine.

Disguise in the first place is a visual symbol of the separation of lovers: they cannot be known by each other, or the world, for what they are.² On the other hand it symbolizes resilience and courage on the disguised lover's part. Mingled with these features is pathos. Since pathos implies the presence of feeling in the character it might not be expected in the most naive romance; but dramatic romance discovered it very early (though that is not so true of narrative romance). In Clyomon we find the following:

Enter Neronis in the Forrest. in mans apparell.

Nē. As Hare the Hound, as Lambe the Wolfe, as foule the Fawcons dint,
So do I flie from tyrant he, whose heart more hard then flint
Hath sackt on me such hugie heapes of seaceles sorrowes here,
That sure it is intollerable, the torments that I beare:

¹ See V.O. Freeburg, Disguise Plots in Elizabethan Drama. A Study in Stage Tradition, New York, 1915, pp.61-68.

² N. Sanders, "The Comedy of Greene and Shakespeare" in Early Shakespeare, p.44.

and so on for another thirty lines of soliloquy.¹ Greene's Dorothea in James IV likewise harps on the pathos of her plight, in a way that becomes a little wearisome,² and Shakespeare's earliest heroine in disguise, Julia, is not immune from the same suspicion. Opportunities for pathos in fact were a little too plentiful: it was so easy to create sentiment from pathos that pathos overindulged became sentimentalism. Pathos required controlling, or leavening with other products of disguise.

The most varied and vital of these was irony. It could take several forms, appearing singly or in combination. The first irony is that of situation, which is of course endemic because the man's appearance conceals the woman's reality. A popular variant of this basic ironical situation is the heroine's service of her beloved, as his page or squire. Here disguise might seem to preclude pathos because it enables the separation of lovers to be overcome, but usually the heroine cannot reveal herself to the man, because of danger or because he has forgotten her. The comfort she draws from being near him as his attendant, therefore, is only bittersweet, and leads back to pathos. Occasionally, as in Rosalynde and As You Like It, she is not prevented from revealing herself if she wants to; but she does not want to, out of charming perversity and the joy of playing a part near her beloved. In either event the man never penetrates her disguise, so that the irony is normally maintained to the last possible moment. Further evidence that Elizabethan dramatists knew the value of

¹Malone Society Reprint, ed. W.W. Greg, 1913, lines 1253-86.

²She is wounded, which even more overworks the pathos.

irony, for purposes of suspense and wit, comes from their care to ensure that the audience knows the heroine's secret from its inception: such information is rarely, if ever, withheld from us until a few Jacobean dramatists tried the alternative, surprise, method.¹ Additional irony was exploitable because, in dramatic versions, the heroine disguised as a boy was really a boy actor. Though the point sounds banal, the dramatists could make surprisingly large capital from it, and Shakespeare in particular seems to have revelled in its effect. He would sometimes complicate it further still.²

So far irony is mainly a consequence of situation and does not necessarily reveal personality. Subtler opportunities for irony are deployed where a heroine's language can be interpreted in several ways, and the multiple meanings may all be present to the heroine's mind, or only partly present. Since they express gaiety, determination, sadness, or many another mood, a very adaptable device is given to dramatists capable of wit and feeling. There were not so many of these before Shakespeare: only Lyly perhaps, and even his ironic play of meaning stayed near the surface. This was preeminently a possibility of romance which was available to all but which only Shakespeare fully developed. G.K. Hunter well illustrates the point by comparing the implications of two passages which arise from similar situations.³ In

¹ Freeburg, pp.84-87, re Jonson's Epicoene and the Philaster of Beaumont and Fletcher. Cf. also B. Evans, Shakespeare's Comedies, Oxford, 1960, who exhaustively analyses the "superior awareness" of heroine and audience.

² TGV IV.iv.153 ff. or AYL IV.1.

³ John Lyly, pp.365-366 (n.7), apropos of p.338 in his text.

Gallathea a disguised heroine says, "My Father had but one daughter, and therefore I could have no sister" (III.ii.39). This stays on the surface, as an elegant and not too baffling riddle. In Twelfth Night, in what may be a recollection of Lyly's passage, Viola says:

My father had a daughter lov'd a man,
As it might be perhaps, were I a woman,
I should your lordship. (II.iv.106-108)

The words are a riddle, but also a wistful admission of loneliness; a hint towards love-declaration, and comic because Orsino's unawareness of what is really going on is faintly absurd. When we say that in the mature Shakespeare romance reaches a culmination, it is with moments like this in mind, where he not only perceives more possibilities in the traditional material than his predecessors, but somehow realizes them simultaneously. The result is rich density of meaning in his use of the motif, combining appearance and reality, concealment and disclosure, sadness and courage, pathos and humour, freedom of expression and constraint.

What meanwhile of the heroes? So much wit, irony and initiative centred on the heroines cannot fail to affect the structural importance and characterization of their men. A traditional muscular hero would no longer do, for the animation and sensibility of his lady must receive its true complement. Neither was the sensitive but complaining protagonist of courtly love literature quite adequate. Then if neither the warrior nor the spaniel was suitable, what kind of masculine sensibility

could complement the female? The problem is a serious one, for if the man shares the lady's style of wit he may seem effeminate¹ and if, as especially in disguise plots, she retains the initiative of action he may appear passive or even stupid.

Shakespeare's predecessors seldom do avoid the pitfalls. Clyomon and Clamydes make uncouth warrior-lovers. The knights of The Old Wives' Tale lack initiative and personality. Lyly's men are so like their ladies as to seem effeminate, or probably we should say that both are like the witty children who acted their roles. Greene's men, like Edward or Lacy or James IV, are morally obtuse. Shakespeare himself adopts various expedients, most of them based on his sources and the genre. Sometimes the man is separated from his lady, by force or fortune: she it is who effects the reconciliation, but at any rate he is not at fault. Sometimes he separates himself by wilfulness or ignorance, which the lady then exposes and cures. Sometimes he does have initiative, but his is now an aggressive role in the encounter of the sexes. Sometimes Shakespeare seems to admit that the man has less spirit than his lady, and makes fun of him. Finally the hero may be given trials to overcome, which, though they are prior and subordinate to those in which the heroine triumphs, nevertheless affirm his merit. Overall however it is still true that in none of our comedies² are the males given initiative and courtesy together.

¹Hunter, John Lyly, pp.254 f. and 299 states the problem excellently, though he approaches it from a slightly different direction.

²Elsewhere too the Duke in MM and Prospero seem to be the only exceptions.

All these procedures however seem at first sight to suffer from objections. In the case of fortuitous separation the hero may be blameless, but he is liable to seem inert if an energetic heroine is present (the case of Valentine). If on the other hand he is to blame, he becomes more interesting because more human; but his erring sensibility may not blend with the lady's lively integrity (Proteus). As for the more aggressive heroes, in becoming more spirited they become less courteous (Petruchio, Berowne, Benedick). To make fun of the man's stupidity, however earnest or amiable it may be, is also not likely to make him seem deserving of a lady who is not stupid (Valentine, Orlando, Orsino). The last method appears best, also the most in accord with tradition. The courage of Orlando and the moral fineness of Bassanio, shown in the wrestling and casket scenes, by no means prevent their being courteous. More important, such qualities vindicate the heroes' worth, however passive the plot subsequently compels them to be. Yet even these heroes incur some suspicion: the one of being too amiably conventional, the other of being helpless in a crisis, both of being more remarkable for luck than for moral energy.

Criticisms like these are frequently made, especially by people who have no critical or scholarly preconceptions. They are natural but, at any rate for Shakespeare, perverse. It is true that romance often celebrates a woman's extraordinary fidelity while showing an equally extraordinary indulgence to the follies and cruelties of man which occasion her tribulation.

The archetypal story is Patient Griselda, but her numerous progeny include Greene's Margaret and Dorothea, and to some extent Shakespeare's Julia and Hero.¹ It is true too that the greater a heroine's initiative the more she tends structurally to eclipse the hero. Notwithstanding these truths, in the first place we are dealing with Shakespeare, who is not as morally indulgent nor as structurally inept as his predecessors. In the second place his young men suit their ladies very well in terms of temperament and emotion. Katherina deserves or needs a Petruchio, Beatrice a Benedick. The diffidence of Claudio is emotionally akin to Hero's shyness. Although Proteus and Claudio do not at first merit their ladies' affection, it may be that (as romance heroes sometimes point out) love has more to do with grace than with merit; or else that desert is established by penitence, which must precede their final acceptance. In either case the religious analogy is often conscious, and the familiar Petrarchan figure of the lady as the lover's "saint" acquires a more genuinely spiritual force. In the third place the superabundance of invention that goes into characterizing some (not all) of the heroines does not entitle us to expect the same attention to be accorded to other types of character. We should not require works written within the romance tradition to possess virtues that seldom occur there: we should appreciate what is there, not repine over local limitations that elsewhere liberate invention. If the heroes are subordinated they are meant to be so.² They are not the less

¹The line continues into the novel, where Dickens for instance exploits the convention to the full.

²Northrop Frye's perceptions are relevant here, see Anatomy of Criticism, Princeton, 1957, pp.167 and 173.

admirable, when, like Sebastian, they reap where they have not sown, so long as they accept their fortune with free generosity and grateful wonder. This they normally do. Finally Shakespeare's heroes show a pattern of development, recognizable by reference to his use of Lyly:

The existence of accomplished dramas dedicated to the image of delicate sentiment and gracious amusement must have made much easier Shakespeare's passage across the middle ground of his comic development—that area in which he had to learn the lightening of power by playfulness [Petruchio into Berowne] and the strengthening of sentiment by understanding [Valentine into Romeo]. And this was just where Lyly's "court comedies" had their virtue.¹

Then can we say why the woman's role in romance might stimulate Shakespeare more, on the whole, than the man's? Any answer to such a question must be rather speculative, and should probably not be simple or categorical. Nevertheless a part of one's answer would once more involve the history of romance literature. Romance had for a long time accorded a kind of supremacy to the woman in that she represents a perfection which the lover adores and a prize which he seeks to win: these elements are presented allegorically in the Romance of the Rose, more straightforwardly in Arthurian romance, but by no means disappear thereafter. On the other hand such a perfection might seem too passive for the reader of romance to share the hero's ardour, and perhaps as a consequence the lady becomes endowed with an elusiveness that may at first remain metaphysical but becomes a personal trait; and becomes even more absorbing whenever her state of mind is further complicated by our sense that she is truly eager to be won but feels compelled (for a

¹G.K. Hunter, John Lyly, pp.347 f.

time) to evade. At such points particularly the lady's nature may retain its traditional force as the perfect object of the hero's quest, but may also offer to the writer of romance the psychological interest of charming inconsistency. The elements of stereotype and contradiction in such a characterization might well make the lady seem callous and her behaviour seem absurd; and certainly not every such heroine avoids the charges. The present point however is that a sensitive and intelligent writer could do much with a heroine in whom perfection was attainable and human: to anticipate for a moment, we may endorse Phialas' conception of a Shakespearean ideal in comedy, "the best that can be hoped for in the world we know",¹ which is articulated through and around such heroines as Rosalind. We may surmise too that Shakespeare had noticed the relatively recent development within romance of a heroine whose perfection is no longer immobilized and aloof but energetic and initiatory; and that he may have felt drawn to the motif of the disguised heroine as a particular instance of her enlarged area of initiative. In conclusion he may have felt that men received so much attention in other genres, history or tragedy, that he welcomed the different emphasis of romance and did not wish to alter it. But these are speculations only.

The ascendancy of love, seen from the heroine's point of view, changed the treatment of other romance elements. In early romances it was often possible to separate the elements, to describe one passage as adventure, another as marvel, and so

¹Shakespeare's Romantic Comedies, p.xiv, cf. pp.33, 165 f., 213 f.

forth; one might discern the precise points at which transitions were made in, for example, Clyomon. But where love-experience was made more important, the sort of adventures and marvels which could not be integrally related to it were correspondingly reduced. Even where they could relate they were transmuted, love gathering to itself these two elements. As love acquired the colours of adventure and the marvellous, the adventures became the marvellous experience of love.

Sens, being the most pervasive of the romance elements, is hardest to detach for discussion. Its presence is implicit in many points already made--in the courage called forth by adventure, in the sense of wonder which marvels exploit, in the psychological observation of love. Nevertheless though sens has many points of contact with love, and some with the adventures and marvels of romance, it is not coextensive with any of them. It can be considered here in two main aspects: the relatively precise one of theme or governing idea; and the vaguer but still important aspect of the serious spirit of romance, and its manner of embodiment in particular works.

The thematic aspect has not lacked discussion, since the methods applied first elsewhere subsequently proved beneficial to the comedies as well: J.R. Brown for example has demonstrated how the theme of reason and imagination unifies the apparently unconnected worlds of A Dream; D.A. Traversi has traced how Love's Labour's Lost exemplifies the idea that knowledge will be found in books less than in experience,

specifically the experience of love;¹ and similar thematic developments have been observed for most of the other comedies, only The Two Gentlemen and Merry Wives having proved somewhat recalcitrant. In the present context what is of most interest is that the main themes always involve love; but though they overlap with love, or run alongside it, or form a part of it, and always illuminate it (as they in turn are illuminated by it) they are usually something other than love tout court.

In its broader aspect *sens* has been less fully examined, so that one feels it necessary still to argue the case for considering romance to have any seriousness at all. How far, and where, does romance invite us to take it seriously? The answer, as elsewhere, involves a historical development—long for narrative romances, shorter for English dramatic romances. Serious implication will not be found in the adventures and marvels of naive romance, nor in its cursory, blundering love-stories. Yet love is feeling; and since it is hard to take actions seriously in art unless they involve feeling, we should expect love to be one of the points at which romance first grew into seriousness. So it proved. Courtly love is found to involve duties, and some rights and privileges, amounting to a system that provides a code of behaviour, and an ideal. Yet although this ideal is taken extremely seriously by the participants, for the reader its pre-suppositions are too unreal and arbitrary to be truly ethical, and the writers of courtly romance tacitly admit this whenever

¹Brown in Shakespeare and his Comedies, Cap.4, Traversi in An Approach to Shakespeare, 3rd edn., New York, 1969, Vol.I, Cap.3; cf. also P.G. Phialas, *op.cit.*

they close with a palinode.¹ Even yet we have not sens. But once the lady becomes a present, sentient character, free and equal with man, the love-relationship opens up an enormous field for serious exploration. The sense of release which results in the work of Lyly and Greene as well as Shakespeare is enormous, because in the case of love par excellence the serious does not exclude the comic. In laying bare "the surprises, psychological quirks and inconsistencies of human love which constitute its logic in art as in life"²--in simpler terms asking what it feels like--the dramatist pursues comedy and sens as complementary purposes.

Such a development would suggest that love drew sens, as it drew marvel and adventure, within its own orbit. To a great extent that is true; but it had to absorb still other aspects of romance, and the nature of what it absorbed is perhaps as important to grasp as the fact that it did absorb. One specific and one generic debt are paramount. These are courtesy and idealism, and will best be considered together.

Courtesy in the present context is not the quality so elaborately described in the literature of amour courtois, though doubtless it is descended from that. Neither is it quite the style of life and manners, supported by Neoplatonic thought-forms, which Castiglione expounded, though again Castiglione probably contributed something. Both forms of courtesy were

¹C.S. Lewis, The Allegory of Love, pp. 41 ff. (Andreas Capellanus, Troilus and Criseyde, Malory etc.)

²N. Sanders, Early Shakespeare, p.40.

too systematic to live in drama, and perhaps concerned with overt behaviour at the expense of health of feeling. But in the better English romancers of the sixteenth century elegant manners and conversation are married with vitality and sympathy. In Lyly elegance counts for more than feeling, in Spenser the opposite is true.¹ In Sidney's Arcadia however a balance is struck as in form between grace and austerity, so in content between courtesy of manners and a courtesy of gentleness. Shakespeare too harmonizes elegant manners with vivacity of feeling.²

The portrayal of these complementary possibilities of life suggests an ideal, for here is a world where young, noble, beautiful people learn to love and receive love, and their quest for love has something of the aspiration towards perfection. The ideal quality, heightened in all these writers by glories of style, reflects an idealizing bent within the whole genre, and where romance idealizes it is, or can be, at its most serious. For one thing idealism does not preclude attention to the un-ideal, a point to which we must return. But secondly the emphasis on human nobility is not, as it has sometimes been accused of being, a form of escape or blindness, nor necessarily naive. For example the advantages of being noble, personable and so on contribute to the ideal, but are never claimed as merits. It is part of the fineness of romance that they are often ignored or

¹ Even in F.Q.VI, where courtesy itself is the virtue celebrated, the ideal of courtesy is a fineness of feeling rather than an elegance of manners.

² The next writer to do so being Jane Austen, in her own kind of romantic comedy.

discounted by their owners; nor are they guards against temptation or corruption (rather the contrary). But good things they are, and they do exist. Romance brings them together to put them at the service of its graver conception of the ideal, that nobility of mind and deed which merits admiration.¹ Of this ideal the power to love is always a part, but sterner powers are also present—the power to make sacrifices, to recognize and endure evil.

In fact, whatever realist critics have said and ordinary theatregoers have felt, romance does not exclude reality. It does exclude the sordid, a heroic exclusion shared by tragedy; and it may exclude the humdrum, though many romancers before Shakespeare leavened the noble with the low-life. Evil however is definitely not excluded. From the old tale of Apollonius of Tyre to Shakespeare's late romances pain, violence and loss, separation, treachery, and the possibility of death² are—along with their opposites—primary themes of romance. The last plays, being more primitive than our group, and nearer to traditional romance, take these evils yet more seriously.³ Romance, like comedy, is optimistic, not because it ignores these realities but because, recognizing them, it accepts them. Its final

¹Cf. G. Beer, The Romance, p.35: "In both Spenser and Sidney the idealization instructs, rather than allowing the reader a complete escape from his own world. Their ideal worlds provide a touchstone for experience."

²Actual death is normally avoided, especially in mature dramatic romance, but the possibility and the thought of death are a force to be reckoned with: often they are coupled with a counterbalancing affirmation of life, especially the continuity of life in marriage and childbirth (cf. above).

³They include some deaths, as only LLL in our group does: WT (Antigonus, Mamillius), Cymbeline (the Queen, Cloten).

emphasis, on reconciliation,¹ is optimistic but not necessarily shallow.

Romance is serious therefore about good and evil. It is true that its concern may be too rigorously moral for many tastes, as in allegorical romances; or too naive, so that purest Good combats blackest Evil and slays it without a thought. But while naive romances continued (and still continue), ethical concern shows as much development as other aspects of romance. Black and white remain, providing a guidance for our sympathies and orientation for the structure, but there come to be many shades of grey. The villain's rancour is no longer a monolithic, diabolic presupposition, nor usually is he killed off at the end;² instead his behaviour is motivated, to the point where, if not justified, it is at any rate made comprehensible. The hero for his part shows some tendency to be no longer a paragon of lofty, inimitable virtue but a less consistent, more humanly faulty being. As a result both psychological veracity and structural momentum are served, because we watch the hero seeking to overcome internal as well as external obstacles to his attainment of the desired ideal, and see the villain opposing that ideal not only in his actions but in what he stands for, as some specific variant of evil. The range over which the respective types can extend is considerable (another advantage): thus the internal obstacles in the hero may be pride (Benedick) or self-indulgence

¹ Visible in Greene's work as well as Shakespeare's.

² Peele's *Sacrapant* is because Peele is heightening the traditional features of romance to make fun of them.

(Orsino), a dogma (Navarre) or complacency (Lucentio), and the villain's ruling motive may be spite (Don John), rankling resentment (Shylock) or self-righteousness (Malvolio).¹ The range of heroism and villainy cannot however be extended indefinitely, because good and evil must remain distinct from one another, nor can the shades of gray merge in the middle. This fact can be recognized from the terminal cases of the rancorous villain who is at times almost a sympathetic figure and of the hero who experiences moral paralysis: Shylock and Proteus. It can of course be disputed how far Shylock really is sympathetic, and whether Proteus does not regain virtue by his penitence, but those questions do not affect the present point, that in the two characters hero and villain move as near to one another as Shakespeare ever allows them. It seems probable that the absence of further experiments along these lines implies that he felt some need to revert to the more clearcut moral polarity usual to romance, by which evil stands morally in plain opposition to the ideal, even though aesthetically the one balances the other. The middle-ground of romance is occupied, as we shall argue, not by the morally ambivalent but by the unromantic and normal: romance can accommodate a good deal, but perhaps not moral confusion, or a questioning of the latent ideal itself.

Romance does not therefore survive by exclusions, though it has to exclude a very few things; on the whole it allows and even welcomes inclusions. In fact its tolerance is the quality

¹Malvolio is not a true villain so much as antisocial, yet his name—"Ill-will"—shows that he is emotionally antipathetic to the desired ideal.

which as much as any other differentiates it and merits critical acclaim. In inept hands it may lead to the indiscriminate inclusion of wildly heterogeneous materials, but if appropriately handled its moral and structural freedom may serve an impressive world-view. The latter is of course implicit rather than obtrusive, yet it can be sensed in two ways, one concerned with man, the other with his containing universe. As G.R. Kernodle expresses it:

Where classic art emphasizes unity, romantic art revels in variety, risking the loss of a strong sense of unity in order to represent the broad scope of human experience. The romantic artist feels such zest for experience that he wants to include everything in the story...But the variety he presents is not without order or meaning.¹

The power of romance to accommodate variety has practical implications too. Variety not only achieves a balancing of ideal and real, it creates a pattern of reflections between elements—one responds differently to the Venetians because of Shylock, to Shylock because of Launcelot Gobbo, and so on. Although such patterning is not purely romantic, for multiple plotting, which can produce the same kind of pattern, is found in medieval narrative and drama, Renaissance epic and classical intrigue drama,² the freedom and tolerance of the romance form make it preeminently capable of combining and comparing disparate worlds.

¹Invitation to the Theatre, New York, 1967, p.79.

²M. Doran, Endeavors of Art, Caps. 10 and 11 discusses how, and how far, multiple plotting is present in these areas of literature. Cf. G.K. Hunter, John Lyly, p.315, re Fulgens and Lucres, Lyly and Shakespeare.

To such an extent can romance do so that its inclusiveness becomes a means of admitting critical perspectives upon itself. It is a paradox of literary creation that the genres offer typical situations and conventions which are of great assistance, yet they will also hamper achievement unless the writer avoids slavish obedience to them. Otherwise the living concerns of romance become dead cliché. Its opportunities and the dangers in this respect emerge if we consider Shakespeare's work in relation to a few earlier dramatic romances.

Clyomon abounds in the traditional paraphernalia of romantic plot—a monster, shipwreck, enchantment and so forth—but it also takes advantage of the genre to include the shepherd Corin, speaking appropriately bucolic dialect. He is certainly amusingly uncouth, at times ribald; yet his comments on his "boy Jacke", actually the heroine Neronis in disguise, are mostly irrelevant to the plot and do not amount to a perspective on high romance. So if the author has seen his opportunity, he cannot seize it. That is no surprise, for neither can he make anything of the hero Clyomon's disguise, which is poorly motivated and yields a moment of disclosure that is bathos rather than climax (lines 1833-46). Peele in The Old Wives' Tale avoids overdependence and organizes his rather similar medley of characters much better. The audience is prepared to expect the conventional range of characters by the different characters of the frame-plot, Madge the old wife and her listeners. With engaging frankness she calls her story "an old wives' winter's tale" and insists on its

being accepted for what it is--stereotyped but entertaining.

Madge: Once upon a time there was a king...he sent
all his men to seek out his daughter, and he
sent so long, that he sent all his men out of
his land.

Frolic: Who drest his dinner then?

Madge: Nay, either hear my tale, or kiss my tail.¹

Fantastic: Well said! on with your tale, gammer.

Her credible, homely presence facilitates acceptance and shows that Peele well understands the nature of his materials. On the other hand the very solidity of the framing characters exposes the lifelessness of the romance characters, so though we sample the pleasures of parody we may also feel that the positive powers of romance go by default.² Greene's James IV is less assured, because the effect of its framing plot is clumsier. Within the main story however Greene achieves a greater degree of balance. The pathetic faithfulness of Dorothea is set off by the wit of her dwarf-page and the assassin's ridiculous braggadoccio, and the framing comments of Bohan and Oberon do not belittle the feeling present in the scene. Shakespeare brings control and feeling together, even in the early, awkward Two Gentlemen. The lyrical efflorescence of the lovers, and the feelings awoken in Proteus and Julia, are quite elaborately counterpointed against the down-to-earth servants. Speed and Launce also balance each other, for one is a Lylyan pert page, the other more clown than fool; and further contrast and (tacit) comment are provided by

¹ Lines 116, 120-124 in the edn. of A.K. McIlwraith, Five Elizabethan Comedies, 1934.

² Perhaps as a result of abridgement in the text; see H. Jenkins, "Peele's Old Wive's Tale", M.L.R., XXXIV, 1939, pp.177-185.

Launce's dog.¹ As H.F. Brooks puts it, all three serve in the economy of the play as "lightning-conductors, allowing the audience to laugh at the extremes of the convention, so that laughter shall not disturb our response when we are required to accept the convention, extremes and all."² Shakespeare would soon make still more expert use of convention, to appraise with intelligent sympathy the genre itself.³

Another method of including perspective on the genre was by mingling genres. Romantic comedy had often done this, for not only in its use of setting was it unashamedly eclectic.⁴ As usual early ventures were not always happy: the "pastoral" of Clyomon, or the elements of Italian intrigue in Common Conditions, only make those plays a yet wilder farrago.⁵ It was some time before the English traditions of fooling were harmoniously joined with romance, but at the later stages of this process, and partly dependent for its success on early failures, comes the brilliant mingling of romance with intrigue in Twelfth Night or with pastoral in As You Like It.

Sens therefore--the serious implication of romance--is present in many ways, at times more pervasively than obviously. It does not, like love, carry the story along; yet at subtler levels it is what makes one romantic comedy rather than another

¹H.F. Brooks, "Two Clowns in a Comedy (To Say Nothing of the Dog): Speed, Launce (and Crab) in The Two Gentlemen of Verona", Essays and Studies 1963, ed. S.G. Putt, 1963, pp.91-100.

²Quoted by C. Leech in the New Arden TGV, Introduction, p.lxix.

³See particularly the Caps. on AYL and TN below.

⁴Doran, pp.189-190, cf. 182-185.

⁵Creizenach, pp.19-20.

linger in the mind. Its significance is multiple, not to be resumed in a sentence; but if a single crucial significance had to be selected it would be the delightful variety which it tolerates. This feature is often noticed by contemporaries, for example Lyly: "...what heretofore hath been served in several dishes for a feast is now minced in a charger for a gallimaufrey,"¹ or Lope de Vega who argues that the variety compounded of the grave and the absurd is pleasing—because it is in accord with Nature.² The delight occasioned by variety is akin to wonder. Wonder in turn is akin to the response solicited by the marvellous, but in shedding the crude spectacle of early romance the marvellous evokes a wonder that connects it with the sensibility of love and the reverence for life which sens can evince. Wonder in fact, by subsuming much else of romance, is the response which Shakespeare himself comes to request of his audiences.³ Not only is wonder one of the last rewards of romance as such, and therefore most deeply pondered in his latest, most mature romances;⁴ it is of particular concern for the dramatist, because wonder more than any other shared concept unites drama with romance. The need to gain belief for an improbable tale—a self-conscious concern which the inclusiveness of romance can contain—corresponds to the need to gain "suspension of disbelief" in the theatre: wonder, operative in the faculty of imagination, is required in both spheres, and most of all where they overlap; in romantic

¹ Prologue to Midas, quoted by Doran, p.189.

² Doran, p.210.

³ E.g. MND IV.i.189-191, V.i.23-27; MA V.iv.70, 91; AYL V.iv.133.

⁴ Cf. Doran, pp.211, 327, 330 f.

comedy. Accordingly from A Dream onwards Shakespeare plays or wrestles with these implications of genre and medium, and though the language may be light and witty the serious concern of the great artist is also present:¹

Hippolyta: This is the silliest stuff that ever I heard.
 Theseus: The best in this kind are but shadows; and the
 worst are no worse, if imagination amend them.
 Hippolyta: It must be your imagination then, and not theirs.

Notwithstanding that the materials of romance as Shakespeare inherited them often went to extremes of crudity, impossibility or sentimentalism, they could yield rich resources to a sensitive artist. It is manifest—from the plays themselves, from their number and the fact that he turned to romance throughout his writing life—that Shakespeare was at home with the genre and constantly stimulated by it.² It is time to consider the comedies of our group in turn, to see in more detail how the generic resources, with his other literary resources, were employed. If at first the influence of romance appears less predominant than the present chapter would suggest, it must be remembered that its influence may be pervasive, or hard to distinguish from the influence of a story-source which is itself romantic. Such is the case with The Two Gentlemen, which is discussed first because, even with these provisos, its dependence on romance is perhaps clearer than that of the other three earlier comedies.

¹The matter is taken further in subsequent chapters, especially that on TN. The passage quoted is MND V.i.208-212.

²Because of Pettet's title, Shakespeare and the Romance Tradition, one expects him to cover much of the same ground as this chapter. He does so to only a limited extent because his conception of romance is narrower—so narrow that he has to argue that Shakespeare could mature only by rejecting romance. The perversity of this view is shown by J.R. Brown, "The Interpretation of Shakespeare's Comedies: 1900-1953", Shakespeare Survey, VIII (1955), p.3.

CHAPTER THREE

THE TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA: AN EARLY ROMANTIC COMEDY

The Two Gentlemen has usually had a mixed reception from critics, whether in the study or the theatre. It is sometimes difficult not to agree that the play is absurd and awkward, though there has been less than universal agreement concerning the cause of the trouble. Yet though this chapter must take account of the causes of dissatisfaction, which indeed I shall argue to be connected with questions of story-tradition and genre, it is better to commence by appraising the play's merits. Its conception is bold, its achievement considerable, and both points are easier to perceive from a study of its source-relationships than if one is unaware of them: in the latter case one may unconsciously blame the play for not being as good as later works, but in the former case it is clear how much has in fact been achieved. The boldness of conception is manifest in the use of story-traditions, the achievement in the detailed comparison of story-sources with the play itself.¹ The use of genre too, though it is at times

¹The sources of TGV are referred to or quoted in the following texts: Boccaccio, The Decameron, in the English trn. of J.M. Rigg, as published in Everyman's Library edn., 2 vols., 1930, though the trn. is actually older; Sir Thomas Elyot, The Governor (1531), in the Everyman edn. of S.E. Lehmberg, 1962; Lyly's Euphues in the edn. of R.W. Bond, The Complete Works of John Lyly, Oxford, 1902 (Vol.I); Yong's trn. of Montemayor's Diana in the edn. of J.M. Kennedy (details given in Cap.1 above), in which the tale of Felismena is found on pp.75-105 and 237-242; and Arthur Brooke's poem The Tragical History of Romeus and Juliet (1562) in G. Bullough's reprint, Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, 1957, I, 284-363 (hereafter referred to simply as "Bullough").

a cause of offence, is imaginative: no other early comedy contains so many generic elements which by recurring in later comedies confirm the wisdom of first choosing to employ them. The present chapter begins by describing the design of The Two Gentlemen, before using this perspective to discuss story-tradition, story-source and genre in that order.

Structurally it is clear that the play is a bold amalgamation of two different story-traditions, each supplying a love-triangle. In the one triangle, deriving from a tradition of friendship stories, Proteus endeavours to detach Silvia from Valentine: Silvia is at the centre of the struggle. In the other triangle, deriving from Montemayor's tale of Felismena, Julia regains Proteus from his infatuation for Silvia: Proteus is at the centre of the struggle. In addition the story of Silvia and Valentine is embellished with adventures from a third tradition, that of Romeus and Juliet.

Thematically the design is equally bold. The play proceeds by antitheses, as so many other plays of Shakespeare do. The primary antithesis involves friendship and love, but is not the straightforward opposition of the two which we might expect. The normal pivot of friendship stories had been the choice between love and friendship, and though the value chosen was now friendship, now love, the terms of conflict and choice remained the same. But Proteus' choice is not simply between

love and friendship, but between friendship (for Valentine) and love (for Julia) on the one hand, and infatuation (for Silvia) on the other.¹ The antithesis is of constancy and inconstancy: Proteus is as inconstant in love and friendship alike as Valentine is constant.² That is why constancy is emphasized when Proteus parts from Julia (II.ii.8); when he sins against it, in the special pleading that he must be "constant" to himself (II.vi.31); and again when he is reconciled to Julia (V.iv.111, 113, 115). Direct opposition between friendship and love is hardly present even at the very beginning (I.i.63-65 comes nearest), and once Valentine has abandoned his disapproval of love the two claims reinforce each other. The conclusion must therefore be that the simple antithesis is muted, or even avoided, in the design of the play.³

Other antitheses are interwoven with the primary antithesis of constancy and inconstancy. Appearance and Reality are set in opposition very early in the action, when Proteus chooses Julia's company above Valentine's and Valentine forswears love: later the one deserts Julia, the other is forced to recant his refusal. The opposition goes deeper however, for it permeates

¹Cf. II.vi.1-5 ("threefold perjury"), for he is wronging Silvia too.

²This is the view of H. Jenkins, communicated privately but touched on in his article "Shakespeare's Twelfth Night", Rice Institute Pamphlet, XLV (1959), Part 4, pp.21-22. I have not seen it in print elsewhere, except in R.M. Sargent, "Sir Thomas Elyot and the Integrity of TGV", PMLA, LXV, 1950, pp.1166-80.

³When Valentine's magnanimity leads him to offer up Silvia to Proteus, the conflict between love and friendship does not occur. The struggles we should naturally expect within Valentine, not to mention Silvia, are ignored in order to stress his exemplary constancy, loyalty, steadfast true-heartedness in friendship, which has all along been stressed (whether by its presence in him or its absence in Proteus).

many details of the play, including the scenes added to the source-material for the clowns and the dog.¹ Above all Julia, appearing to lose honour by her audacious sex-disguise, in fact gains it because

It is the lesser blot, modesty finds,
Women to change their shapes than men their minds.
(V.iv.108 f.)

These words are climactic since they usher in Proteus' affirmation of constancy; and penetrating since they allow that appearances are at times manipulated to serve truth rather than falsehood.

The antinomies of structure and theme are served by the combining of stories, and suggest that the stories are meant to balance one another. Thus the title of the play may suggest that the two friends and their interaction were first in Shakespeare's mind, and insofar as their friendship is shown first in the play and is emphasized in the finale it may seem to be foremost as well as first. On the other hand since Julia is mentioned in the first scene and dominates the second, she must have been important throughout the writing. The characterization equally suggests that an equipoise is intended, for the one story has a triangle of two men and a woman, the other has one of two women and a man: the two triangles are united by the presence in both stories of a disruptive man, false friend in the one story, false lover in the other. The play explores the personalities of four lovers, in

¹H.F. Brooks, "Two Clowns in a Comedy..." works out the pattern of antinomies very fully. Cf. also N. Sanders, ed. New Penguin Shakespeare TGV, 1968, Introduction, and D.A. Traversi, An Approach to Shakespeare, 3rd edn., I.78-84.

their different situations within the entanglement, and can show them interacting with one another.¹ The four are almost equally prominent in the action, and a further advantage is that four is the right number to provide a happy ending. In all these respects the design is symmetrical.

In seeking to gain a true perspective we have had to argue from the play back to the sources. Now perhaps we can proceed to our proper business, the illumination by sources of the play: let us consider what opportunities and difficulties the multiple traditions presented and how Shakespeare responded. It will be convenient to take the friendship stories first. They occur in two main forms, Friendship Triumphant and Friendship Betrayed. In the former one friend falls in love with the other friend's betrothed, and thanks to the second friend's magnanimity wins her. Trials follow for both, but friendship emerges victorious. In the latter form the same crisis develops but now the one friend does not disclose his love to the other, but conspires to steal the lady's heart from him.

Stories of Friendship Triumphant, whether or not calling the two friends Titus and Gisippus, were numerous. S.L. Wolff follows Grimm and Rohde in tracing them back to late Greek romance,² and medieval versions include one in the Gesta Romanorum.³

¹Only Julia and Valentine are not seen together until the final scene, and there Shakespeare makes amends (V.iv.86-90, 116-120, 162-169).

²The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction, New York, 1912, pp.248 ff.

³No. CLXXI, pp.322-325 in the trn. of Swan and Hooper. Lyly's Campaspe is a kindred story.

Boccaccio's version in the Decameron (X.8) became so well-known however that subsequent versions are more likely to derive directly or indirectly from him than from his predecessors. The story was popular in sixteenth century England, since versions are known to have been made by Walter, Elyot and Lewicke, and at least two anonymous playwrights.¹ Most of these versions are undistinguished, deviating from Boccaccio only for the worse, and since they are fully discussed in the works I have mentioned they need not concern us. Boccaccio and Elyot however are more illuminating.

Boccaccio's story is from Book X, which celebrates magnificence or magnanimity: Gisippus' sacrifice of Sophronia to the lovesick Titus is matched in generosity by Titus' willingness to be punished for the murder with which Gisippus has been charged. As we should expect however, the idealization of friendship does not preclude an interest in less exemplary motivation: Titus struggles with himself and Gisippus has to press him hard to reveal that he is sick for love of his friend's betrothed. Gisippus, having nobly decided that "Sophronia must be less dear to him than his friend's life" (II.306), becomes brisk in contriving the bedtrick by which she shall sleep with Titus in place of himself, arguing that once the trick is accomplished no protest by the lady or her family can undo the union. The motivation is equally realistic when Sophronia

¹Cf. New Arden TGV, Introduction, pp.xxxv-xl; Wolff, ibid., who gives a table of correspondences between versions (pp.258-261); H.G. Wright, Early English Versions of the Tales of Guiscardo and Ghismonda and Titus and Gisippus from the Decameron, E.E.T.S., 1937, Introduction; and L. Sorieri, Boccaccio's Story of Tito e Gisippo in European Literature, New York, 1937.

finds out. First she weeps and complains, finally she acquiesces, "making a virtue of necessity". (II.315).¹ As a result the story combines an attractive ideal of sacrificial friendship with a lively representation of more realistic behaviour--the inherent virtues of such a story, best realized by Boccaccio. He does however raise, without satisfying, curiosity about the woman's point of view: Sophronia is brusquely, not to say discourteously, treated by the two friends, whose idealism does not affect their morality in this particular. Boccaccio gives enough stress to the woman's point of view to make the reader reflect that he might have done better to ignore it or extend it. Shakespeare is surely right to play down Silvia's reactions at the denouement where Valentine, like Gisippus, resigns his lady, though in almost everything else he extends the roles of the women.

Sir Thomas Elyot in The Governor avoided the difficulty, or was preserved from it, by his declared intention to "rehearse a right goodly example of friendship" (p.136). He names Sophronia only once and does not describe her reactions when Titus reveals the trick. Since he does not provide a sister of Titus to marry Gisippus at the end, as Boccaccio had done, one suspects that he found the female point of view unnecessary. On the other hand its omission makes his tale more austere, and since he ends with a war of vengeance waged by Titus upon Gisippus' countrymen, his exemplary intention begins to seem forbidding. At all events

¹ Though the phrase is proverbial, it may be significant that it is found at TGV IV.i.62.

Shakespeare could not follow Elyot in these respects: for comedy, which concludes with weddings rather than warfare, he would naturally find more help in Boccaccio. For the female point of view he followed neither predecessor.

Elyot's alterations and expansions of Boccaccio were therefore not all felicitous. Moreover in trying to make the bedtrick more plausible, because the two friends even looked alike, he actually makes it less plausible.¹ The bedtrick is such a standard device of romance and drama that we accept it without thinking, but when Elyot compels us to think about it he promotes detachment and dissent. Yet in some respects he had more to offer Shakespeare than Boccaccio did. In dwelling on another detail, the struggle of conscience which Titus undergoes before and while declaring his love to Gisippus, Elyot has realized what possibilities that situation possessed (pp.138-140).² Titus rebukes himself bitterly and calls himself "false traitor". He broods on the relations between constancy and man's fragile reason. It even seems that, by cruel irony, his friend's "trust is the cause that I am entrapped"--a trust he returns by conspiring treason. Shakespeare too sees that treachery, reason, constancy and trust are involved, and dwells upon these moral implications. Proteus is partly entrapped by passion, and Valentine's tactless, trusting praise of Silvia is partly

¹Elyot was not alone in this respect, for Amis and Amiles too were friends so alike as to be virtually Doppelgänger to each other (Sorieri, p.xiii, and cf. pp.153-154).

²Cf. R.M. Sargent, "Sir Thomas Elyot and the Integrity of TGV", pp.1171-2 and 1174-5.

to blame (II.iv.188-210).

Proteus' betrayal however is actual not mental: willed, persevered in, and unconfessed before his exposure compels penitence. In these respects Shakespeare parts company with the tradition of Titus and Gisippus to follow a shorter tradition, in which friendship is not victorious over love but broken by it. The Knight's Tale of Chaucer is such a story, but the usurping Arcite is not so much a betrayer of Palamon as a fellow-victim of fortune. In Lyly's Euphues..The Anatomy of Wit (1578) on the other hand, itself descended from Boccaccio,¹ deliberate deceit is not only involved but made central, for though Lyly's story takes friendship as its starting-point its subject is not friendship but wit, and its treatment is not exemplary but, as the title proclaims, analytical. So whereas Boccaccio tells an idealizing story in a moderately realistic way, Lyly, inverting, tells a realistic story of moral failure in a prose that seeks ideal grace. When Euphues employs his wit to argue himself out of loyalty to Philautus, we are a stride nearer to Proteus, in whom a protracted struggle combined with a quibbling appearance of reason also precedes a fall.

On the other hand Shakespeare appears to be less concerned with elegance for its own sake, since not only is his style more clearly differentiated from sophistry outside Proteus' part than Lyly's from Euphues': he develops moral intensity, in the mingled anguish and cupidity of Proteus' self-deception. Compare

¹Wolff, The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction, pp.248 ff.

for instance Euphues' words, "Shall I not then hazarde my lyfe to obtaine my loue? and deceiue Philautus to receiue Lucilla?" (I.209, lines 30-31) with those of Proteus:

Is it my mind, or Valentinus' praise,
Her true perfection, or my false transgression,
That makes me reasonless to reason thus?
She is fair; and so is Julia that I love—
That I did love, for now my love is thaw'd....
(II.iv.192-196)

Where Euphues by puns (life/love, deceive/receive) glides glibly over the crux, Proteus' play on reason/reasonless conveys a moral vertigo; and where Euphues' talk of risking life is an empty posturing Proteus' abrupt transitions suggest a soul grappling with its own contradictions.¹

Shakespeare also concentrates his effect more than Lyly for only Proteus is disloyal, whereas Lucilla in the novel accompanies Euphues in disloyalty.² Since all but Proteus are to show constancy Shakespeare is prevented from using Lyly's ironical conclusion, in which Lucilla deceives Euphues as well as Philautus, and the two friends are reconciled by common disappointment. Though he has other intentions for his finale, and there is no element of sour grapes in his celebration of friendship, the two authors nevertheless share the broad conception of a weak nature forced by bitter experience towards self-knowledge.

¹In a way that anticipates Angelo and Troilus, Brutus and Claudius.

²Indeed her fall is almost more striking than that of Euphues, for example where her clever puns ape reason but actually subvert it: "Let my father vse what speeches he lyst, I will follow mine owne lust" (I.207, lines 20-21, and the whole speech).

The chief opportunities offered by the whole tradition are therefore these: a legend of magnanimity, whose ideal courtesy was not ill-suited to romance; a psychological probing of the springs of deceit and self-deception; the irony of love, which makes a man love a woman he cannot honourably win; and a variety of possible endings. The chief disadvantages are the counterpart of the opportunities: a concept of magnanimity that seems more extravagant and immature than admirable; a moral volte-face, by the friend at the centre of the triangle, so sudden as to strain even the belief that love's onset is violently swift; a tendency to let clever but frivolous style oust serious exploration of feeling; a plot ending in implausible contrivance, whether sardonic or idealizing, rather than in what character necessitates. Overall the danger of distorting feeling and the opportunity of exploring it come to Shakespeare in roughly equal measure.

To this story is joined the story of a man who loves two ladies. He woos and wins one of them, but is forced to travel and leave her. At last she decides to follow him, choosing male disguise for the purpose, but when she arrives where he is she finds that he has forgotten her and is courting a second lady. She becomes his page, and after many vicissitudes reveals her identity. He repents, and they are reunited. As we have argued in the first chapter the story comes to Shakespeare from Felismena's tale in Diana. That tale however possesses typical elements and a story-tradition of its own, which are not irrelevant as background

to The Two Gentlemen. It seems to have been inspired by Bandello's novella¹ of Nicuola and Lattanzio (II.36), which derives in turn from the anonymous Gl'Ingannati (1537). The elements common to all three include the heroine's disguise and her interviews in disguise with the lover and his new lady. The same points appealed greatly to Shakespeare, to judge by this play and Twelfth Night. Innovations of Montemayor sometimes appealed, sometimes not. He has the story narrated by the jilted heroine, from her own point of view, beginning where she is being courted by the lover and at first resists. Previous versions had ignored or barely alluded to these beginnings, but Shakespeare follows Montemayor closely, as we shall see in a moment. On the other hand the versions prior to the Spaniard's had had their reasons for omission: they pressed on to the imbroglio (familiar from Twelfth Night) where the disguised heroine arouses the love of the other lady. Montemayor in his turn includes this impasse, but unlike his predecessors he makes it end unhappily; because no twin brother of the heroine arrives to satisfy the other lady she dies of unrequited love. Shakespeare too does not involve a twin brother; but, probably because the play was to be a comedy, and he was to have a second gentleman, no one dies. Nor does he use the complete imbroglio, for Silvia does not love the disguised Julia.

So far the pattern emerging is this: Shakespeare borrowed from Montemayor some things which were common to the tradition, and

¹Kennedy, p.xxii.

did not borrow some of the novelist's innovations. This is grossly to underestimate the value of Diana to the play, but the full nature of the debt is better considered in a moment, in the study of Diana as main story-source. For the present let us assess how the joining of the two main traditions was accomplished and to what effect. The first question cannot be answered with any confidence, but presumably Shakespeare noticed that the element common to both traditions was the disruptive male. Behind Proteus stand Titus, Euphues and Felix. It may be that when Felix joined the others in his mind Shakespeare conceived the idea of adding Felismena's tale to a friendship tale—or that Proteus, already formed from Felix, suggested the addition of a friendship story. We shall never know which way round it was, indeed both parts of the story could have been present all the time. On the question of effect however we can be more categorical. In the first place the joining of traditions allowed Shakespeare to achieve a harmonious ending, since he now had two people of either sex to dispose in marriage. The ending was moreover inherent in what preceded it, not so contrived as Boccaccio's sudden provision of a spare sister. Second and more important Shakespeare has reinforced the sense by duplicating it. Proteus' double betrayal is a graver matter than Euphues' single one and his double reconciliation is the more triumphant. The multiple examples of constancy render his inconstancy the blacker, while reassuring us that fidelity is possible. Moreover the structural strengthening and moral reassurance are furthered by the insertion of details

from the third story-tradition, that of Romeo and Juliet. Shakespeare could have known this tale from Bandello's novella, Boaistuau's French version, or Painter's Palace of Pleasure (1567), as well as in the version he certainly knew, that of Arthur Brooke (1562).¹ As with the other traditions he ignored the tragic ending for The Two Gentlemen, but he supplemented the story and personalities of Valentine and Silvia with various details, no doubt because for the relations of these two characters he could not use the callousness of Gisippus towards Sophronia, nor the pallid relations of Philautus with Lucilla. This tradition is however so subordinated to the other two that its use will be described later at the level of detail rather than structure.

Yet if the power of combining different materials is impressive, how much more impressive is Shakespeare's power to exploit a story-source. He simultaneously exploits and surpasses Diana; it is above all a creative dependence which emerges from detailed comparative scrutiny of the texts.

Shakespeare omits much from Montemayor's tale--sometimes because the material is unsuitable in mood. At Felismena's first appearance for example she kills "three monstrous and foule Savages" who are about to attack Diana (p.75); and later she rescues her lover when he is outnumbered in combat (pp.237-238). Amazonian prowess is not found in Julia, because Shakespeare prefers more womanly qualities in a heroine. Nevertheless the play may use

¹Details in Bullough, I.269-276.

these rescues in altered ways, for its finale occurs in a pastoral setting, as they do, and a lady is captured by outlaws--and then threatened with assault. If there is recollection of the novel here, Shakespeare exhibits thrift, in redeploying what he had to omit in its original form; and skilful placing, since there is only one outburst of violence and it occurs close to the denouement.

The requirements of a dramatic as opposed to a narrative form naturally dictated a number of changes. In the first place Felismena's story was told to Diana's court amid pastoral tranquillity; but though The Two Gentlemen is not without pastoral suggestion, this is inside the story of Julia and the others, not outside as a frame. Secondly Julia's story could not well be presented in the manner of Felismena's, namely flashback--certainly not going back to a time before her birth (pp.80-83): instead, of necessity compressing, Shakespeare begins in medias res, with Valentine about to leave Verona and Proteus already wooing Julia. He could not retain first-person narration. Nor could the action proceed thereafter as in the novel, where letters, sonnets and serenades move it along at an agreeable but rather gentle pace: the play includes fewer of these essentially leisurely devices than the novel. Tact is also evident here because whereas Felix serenades Felismena as later he does Celia (pp.86 and 88) Shakespeare's single serenade forms a dramatic climax. At times moreover drama as a medium is not only more economical but more splendid. The serenade and the fine courting clothes of Felix which have to be described at length in the novel (pp.88-92) can

be staged directly and make a greater impact.

These omissions appear to derive from differences of mood and medium: other passages of Montemayor might have been used if Shakespeare had not conceived a better way. Thus when Felismena reaches the court where Felix has gone, she meets the host of her inn (p.88), and later Fabius, her beloved's page (pp.91-94). Shakespeare, rearranging, makes the host more prominent, because a genial, thick-skinned male is a useful foil to the suffering Julia during the serenade. Montemayor's character Fabius, witty page to Felix, disappears. His functions are absorbed by the host and the serenade itself; his wit divided between Julia herself and Launce; his unhappiness between Julia and Proteus. Strictly Fabius' counterpart is Launce, but the latter is amusingly impervious to his master's sorrowing soulfulness.

The pattern of Shakespeare's omissions from Diana shapes what he selects from the novel. Accordingly the abandonment of first person narration requires, or enables, him to vary the point of view in a way that the novel did not. Proteus speaks for himself now, also for Julia: she speaks for him as well as for herself. Moreover material from the novel must be adapted to the overall scheme, which includes material from the other two story-traditions, not to mention characters added to supply contrast and comment. We can therefore expect the study of materials selected from Diana to exhibit a pattern that is complex, and it is not the least value of such a study that it reveals how, and even why, the pattern has been complicated.

Complications are soon evident. A major purpose of the first six scenes of the play is to bring the relations of Proteus and Julia to the point where the two are separated. The skeleton of incident corresponds to Montemayor's, but the degree of dependence varies with the point of view--which means that it varies a good deal. In I.i the point of view is mainly Proteus'; in I.ii it is Julia's (and Lucetta's); in I.iii Proteus' and his father's; in II.ii Proteus' and Julia's, the two being brought together in a little climax to this part of the action; then in II.iii Launce's. Speed, Launce, the dog and Proteus' father are additions of Shakespeare's, made no doubt to this very end of increasing the complexity of viewpoint.

The importance of the added perspectives must be great because Shakespeare begins them so early--even before he has completed the exposition, which is obviously the primary requirement of his opening scene. We meet the friends first, and learn that Proteus is in love: the emotion has to undergo Valentine's tacit scorn (at this stage). Next we learn that the lady is named Julia, then that Proteus has taken an initiative and written her a letter: information is combined here with suspense. Suspense is amusingly maintained too, because Proteus cannot find out from Speed how the letter was received--a further irony at the lover's expense. Not much of all this comes from Diana, where Felismena begins her tale much further back and Felix' overtures are described only from her point of view. Yet the letter itself comes from Montemayor (pp.83-84), and the ironical viewpoint may reflect the string of devices used by

Felix, rather indiscriminately one feels, to catch Felismena's attention (ibid.).

In the next scene however, which it has been no minor function of the opening scene to introduce, and so to heighten its effect, Shakespeare draws heavily on Montemayor. Both authors show their heroine vacillating between revelation and concealment of love, and venting her uncertainties of mood upon a not entirely innocent maid. Because Shakespeare cannot allow hours to pass in between vacillations, but must practise a dramatist's compression, Julia cannot change direction so many times: nevertheless his scene has the essential configuration of Montemayor's narrative. He begins by improvising, with some help perhaps from the romance genre,¹ a review of suitors by Lucetta for Julia's amusement: the review enables the lady to talk about Proteus without appearing over-interested, and Lucetta to hand over his letter. Now Julia's sly forwardness turns into outraged modesty. This is the point at which Shakespeare starts to draw on Diana; but by giving Julia an initial forwardness he sets up earlier and more clearly the rhythm of vacillations which shapes the scene. Both heroines indignantly dismiss their maids. Next they reopen the subject of conversation, indirectly rather than openly: Julia learns her slyness from Felismena (p.84). On the other hand she is more imperious, for she summons Lucetta back, whereas Felismena is so abashed that she waits for a routine appearance by Rosina.

¹Cf. Greene's Orlando, I.i.

The maid's dropping of the letter is much the same in both authors, except that Shakespeare takes it more briskly, for it occurs on this same reappearance of the maid. The mistress promptly confiscates it on the excuse that it is a love-letter intended for the maid. The excuse for impounding it does not seem a very good one, but mistress and maid well understand that it is an excuse, framed for the eventuality they both want--the reading of the letter. Both authors seize on the unreasonable yet crafty pretences of a woman in love, and Julia and Felismena maintain their pose of indignation. On the other hand, while the same essentials appeal to both writers, Shakespeare makes an effective addition: Julia demonstrates her disdain by tearing up the letter, and has to feign further fury when Lucetta goes to pick up the pieces. Felismena is not alone when she reads; nor is her letter damaged. By a further invention Shakespeare has Julia drop some pieces again, changing her reasons for doing so all the time (I.ii. 109-129). At the close of the scene either heroine addresses her maid once more, but again differently, because Felismena apologizes to Rosina but Julia scolds Lucetta, while continuing to change her mind every few seconds (p.86, I.ii.130-140).

As a whole therefore the scene exhibits the extent of Shakespeare's dependence, which is certainly considerable; and its manner, which is both fertile in selection, and ingenious in improvisation. The impression which this part of Diana made on him is also manifest from his verbal reminiscences--a view which is supported rather than disproved by the fact that the reminiscences do not

always occur at the same point of Shakespeare's story as in Montemayor's. I have noted the following parallels: "making the matter strange" (p.83, line 32), cf.I.ii.102; "Tylt and Tourneyes" (p.83, line 37, and p.86, line 36), cf.I.iii.30 (transposed but adjacent); "minion" (p.84, line 12), cf.I.ii.88 and 92; "modestie and shame" (p.84, line 27), cf.I.ii.41 and 55, and 51; and "the longest and most painfull night, that ever I passed", (p.85, lines 3-4), cf.IV.ii.135-136. In most of these cases one feels that the borrowed words achieve more emphasis in Shakespeare's placing, though the feeling hardly admits of proof. But in the last case,¹ where the transposition is greatest, the new effect is the most powerful: words rather excessive apropos of the night Felismena spends waiting to open the letter from Felix are plangently apposite to the night on which Julia learns that Proteus is unfaithful. At all events the cluster of words which Shakespeare appears to have absorbed from this passage of Diana is another sign of its quality, and of his appreciation and tenacious recollection of vivid detail.

After this scene the two authors correspond less closely. In Montemayor the sequel is a letter from Felismena to Felix, containing a qualified refusal. As a result he redoubles his attentions; and after a year has elapsed she accepts (pp.86-87). No sooner has she done so than his father, who has received intelligence of the suit, intervenes and sends Felix off to the "Princesse Augusta Caesarinas court, telling him, it was not meete

¹The only one not recorded in the commentary to the New Arden TGV.

that a young Gentleman...should spend his youth idly at home, where nothing could be learned, but examples of vice..." (p.87, lines 6-10). Felix goes, too disconsolate even to tell Felismena. Shakespeare retains this broad outline in I.iii, but makes changes in almost every detail. Julia replies to Proteus, but instead of a coy refusal sends a direct acceptance, so that there is no need for a year to pass in courtship. Proteus' father has just decided to send his son off to court as Proteus learns that Julia returns his love: it is a similar ironical twist of fortune. On the other hand the father's motivation has altered, for what are pretexts in Felix' case are given as reasons by Proteus' father. There is no conspiracy against the lovers--probably Shakespeare saw no need for one, or wanted to avoid duplicating the later conspiracy of Silvia's father with Proteus against Valentine. More important, Proteus is less submissive and more cunning than Felix. He tries to outwit his father, but is easily outmanoeuvred (I.iii.52-87): Shakespeare has perhaps made the addition to prefigure the collapse of his later machinations. Still more important Proteus does not go tamely away without taking leave of Julia. Instead they have a scene together, short but touching, which is parting and betrothal at once; moreover the rings they exchange will be heard of later, during more troubled interviews (IV.iv, V.iv). These additions, all perfectly natural, indeed generic to romance, are economically used, to make a local character-point yet also to strengthen major themes of the play. The same is true of the next scene, where in

a complex way the comically parodic parting of Crab from Launce's family lightens and heightens the effect of the lovers' parting.¹ Yet here too Shakespeare may be capitalizing on a hint from Montemayor, since the origin of Julia's (and Crab's) silences at departure may well be Felix' silent departure from home. If so a trait that marks his "great greefe" (p.87, line 11) but hardly contributes to our belief in his subsequent defection, has been transferred to the true lover whom it better suits. A further point gained would be the implicit comment this silence makes on Proteus' loquacity, since, as he himself says, "truth hath better deeds than words to grace it" (II.ii.18).

The next shared incident is the fickleness of the lover, but because the two authors adopt different ways of telling the story it is reported earlier by Shakespeare. Felismena learns of her betrayal only when she reaches court, and so does the reader: we are never told how it came about. Shakespeare however reports the betrayal at the time when it happens (II.iv and II.vi) and gives it a very full presentation. He uses the friendship tradition to some extent, since Diana offered nothing: because the volte-face is pivotal to the whole design, he cannot simply take it for granted. In two impressive soliloquies he makes a virtue of necessity.

A further result of the change is also beneficial, for now the next event, the heroine's departure from home to join her

¹H.F. Brooks, "Two Clowns in a Comedy", pp.91-100. Cf. also the Introdn. to the New Penguin Shakespeare TGV, ed. N. Sanders.

lover, occurs immediately after he has betrayed her. The pathetic irony is obvious enough, but Shakespeare has engineered it better, and he further improves it by altering the heroine's mood as she sets out. Felismena fears lest Felix forget her and therefore goes to forestall her rivals, but Julia has no such doubts. Pathetically she proclaims his constancy just after he has proved inconstant (II.vii.68-78), in a conversation which is a clever expansion of a hint in the source. Montemayor mentions, without naming, one of Felismena's "approved friends, and treasouresse of my secrets, who bought me such apparell, as I willed her" (p.87, lines 32-33). Shakespeare brings back Lucetta for this purpose among others. She voices the kind of fears felt by Felismena, which enables them to be expressed without implying doubt in the heroine's mind. Two other lively features of the source required less expansion: the heroine's fear for her reputation, and her gaiety in adopting male costume. Both are of course endemic to the situation, which is generic to romance; but I believe there is a specific correspondence of attitude. "Reputation" (p.87, line 35) is echoed in "repute" (II.vii.59), and "habit" (line 26) recurs at II.vii.39; but more important is the way both girls nervously laugh at themselves. Felismena trembles for her "deere reputation" but briskly continues that she "trotted directly to the Court". In other words none of the imagined hazards materialized. Julia too graduates, from fear of men (lines 40-41) to giggling excitement (lines 45-55), to fear for her reputation (lines 57-68). Nevertheless

her moods are more numerous and continue longer than Felismena's, so that Shakespeare is more clearly exploiting the possibilities of sex-disguise.

Julia is out of sight while Proteus intrigues against Valentine, courts Silvia and fools her third suitor, Thurio. In place of Montemayor, Shakespeare is now using ideas from Euphues (the friend's treachery and the foolish third lover), Brooke (Valentine's banishment) and possibly intrigue comedy. In IV.ii however Julia reappears, in a scene that is modelled on Diana but has greater density of meaning. As we should expect the presentation varies more than in the source, where because everything, except perhaps the songs, is tied to Felismena's point of view the sole effect is graceful pathos. Shakespeare by contrast begins the scene with Proteus, first in soliloquy, then in a diverting exchange with the stupid Thurio: as a result pathos and irony, moral decline and unfeeling wit compose an ominous mood for the entry of Julia.

When Julia enters (line 26) the scene begins to use suggestions from Montemayor, for she is attended by the host, as Felismena is. Yet there is also a difference in that Felismena dares not ask her host where Felix resides, but by chance the host invites her to hear the serenade—sung by no other than Felix (pp.89-90). Julia is less timorous with her host, and although the music is still his idea of good entertainment for her he suggests it in order to relieve her sadness. She is "allycholly" (line 26), and this too marks an important extension

of Montemayor. Whereas Felismena left home from jealous doubt of Felix, but at Court is not sad until Fabius' voice calls up in her "a thousand doubttes and imaginations (repugnant to my rest)" (p.88, lines 22-23), Julia left home joyfully unsuspecting, yet now a shift of feeling has occurred and the ominous expectancy of lines 1-25 is reinforced.

Though the serenade itself is shorter in Shakespeare the implication and range of reaction are greater. It is true that there is some diversity of implication in the source, for Felismena's moods are shifting. At first she is restless, but then she recognizes her lover's voice and is overjoyed; yet joy becomes the pain of betrayal, which increases until day dawns and she goes miserably to bed. Nevertheless Shakespeare achieves greater diversity and more pronounced ironies. Ostensibly Proteus sings the song to Silvia on Thurio's behalf, yet in fact he hopes the song will enhance his own suit. Julia, listening, learns that she is forgotten and hears the name of her rival. Meanwhile the host placidly enjoys the music and later, as befits the plain man among these high proceedings, he falls asleep. Montemayor's serenade therefore provided Shakespeare with good material, which he exploited fully and extended.

There are also verbal recollections hereabouts. In Montemayor's rather diffuse serenade (pp.88-91) we find a number of words which appear, rearranged, in Proteus' song to Silvia: we find "helpe" (p.89, line 1); "eies" (p.89, lines 11, 16); "love"

(p.89, line 34 and p.90, line 6); "commending" (p.90, line 1); "wise" (pp.90, lines 9, 22 and 30 and 91, line 4); "faire" (p.90, line 10); "fairest eies" (p.90, line 20); and "kinde" (p.90, lines 23 and 32). In addition the words "love blinding my eies", which occur nearby (p.87, lines 28-29), show similarities with the second stanza of Shakespeare's song. So while it is plain that the ideas of Shakespeare's song are commonplaces, the sheer accumulation of recurrences suggests that he is partly recalling
¹
Diana.

When the song is finished Shakespeare diverges still further. He adds two exchanges for Julia and the host, and between these the passage in which Julia listens to Silvia's rebuke of Proteus. Yet even here he is capitalizing on occasional suggestions from the source, for the rebuke borrows from the sequel to Montemayor's serenade: Fabius' description of his master's passion and its rejection (pp.92-94), Celia's letter of rebuke (p.95) and the words of Felix to "Valerius" (pp.96-97). But what is scattered in the source Shakespeare concentrates, and what is repetitive without achieving emphasis he makes forceful. The scene closes with three borrowings from the source: Julia asks the host—directly again, unlike Felismena—where Proteus lodges; she echoes Felismena's language (p.85, lines 3-4, cf. above); and she has the last words of the scene to deliver.

¹ As far as I know this is a new suggestion.

IV.iv is the last scene of the play to be based on the novel. It is in fact particularly close, but as usual changes, omissions and additions alter the effect of what is borrowed. At the beginning Julia is present, but Proteus is in charge: for Shakespeare's design he rather than she is the pivotal figure. The addition of a soliloquy for Launce before their entry (lines 1-36) and an exchange for Proteus and Launce almost at once (lines 40-57) have the effect of emphasizing and ridiculing Proteus. After this lightening and varying of perspective Shakespeare begins to rely more on Diana, as the immediate verbal echo of "entertain" suggests (pp.94, line 29 and 97, line 40, cf. IV.iv.59, and also 87). He seizes and expands on Montemayor's hint that Felix engages the "boy" because of a strangely rapid, trusting affection for him:¹

Thither I went, and he entertained me for his Page,
making the most of me in the worlde, where, being
but a few daies with him, I sawe the messages,
letters, and gifts that were brought and carried
on both sides.... But after one moneth was past,
Don Felix began to like so well of me, that he
disclosed his whole love unto me....

(p.94, lines 28-31, 35-36)

By deleting the month, Shakespeare makes the friendship more rapid and more remarkable. This liking is of course understandable to those who know the boy's identity, and prefigures the reconciliation; but only Shakespeare dwells on the liking, so that we wonder if

¹Together with relief at no longer having to employ the services of Launce: this is a comic addition of the dramatist.

Proteus gives so many reasons because he himself is puzzled by the warmth of his affection.¹ In Shakespeare, as in Montemayor, the page becomes her lover's trusted emissary to her own rival, but Shakespeare adds a ring to the letter which she bears in both stories. The addition may have been suggested by the "gifts" which Montemayor mentions (p.94), but because the ring is the one Julia gave Proteus at their engagement, Shakespeare has found the aptest visible token of Proteus' change of heart.

After Proteus has given Julia the ring the centre of interest shifts to the heroine and her reactions to each part of her strange errand. In these reactions, though they are not identical with Felismena's, Shakespeare owes more to Montemayor than in any other part of the story. Proteus, like Felix, mentions his first love without being prompted to, while he is commissioning Julia, and she like Felismena takes the chance to administer a mild rebuke. Felismena says, "for if the other Ladie, whom you served before, did not deserve to be forgotten of you, you do her (under correction my Lord) the greatest wrong in the world" (p.95, lines 14-16). Julia says, "I cannot choose/But pity her.../Because methinks that she lov'd you as well/As you do love your lady Silvia" (lines 72-73, 75-76). Shakespeare's rebuke is considerably gentler and less direct. Moreover it stands alone, whereas Felismena repeats the rebuke later (pp.96, 97). This amounts to a difference of character, for although Julia was bolder than Felismena in enquiring of the

¹Orsino's feeling for "Cesario" is similar, cf. Doran, p.326. Both men love the reality of their pages, as opposed to the appearance of the ladies they think they love. Proteus touches on this anti-thesis at line 64.

host as to her lover's whereabouts, when face to face with him she is more timid.

A gap between Proteus' exit and Silvia's entrance is covered by Julia's soliloquy. It serves several other purposes however. Its genesis must be the description of Felismena's thoughts as she goes to Celia:

...I went to Celias house, imagining by the way
the wofull estate, whereunto my haplesse love had
brought me; since I was forced to make warre
against mine owne selfe, and to be the intercessour
of a thing so contrarie to mine owne content.
(p.97, lines 31-35)¹

It is this war which Shakespeare's soliloquy enacts, for Julia swings back and forth between a pity for Proteus which would make her carry out his errand faithfully and a pity for herself which would make her ensure that the errand fails. Both feelings are experienced by Felismena too, who speaks of her pity for Felix to Celia (p.98), and shows it by inventing messages for him from Celia in order to keep up his spirits (pp.98 and 101, line 32): her pity for herself she had showed already, while listening to the serenade or rebuking Felix. What Montemayor does not do is to bring these two emotions together and explore the division in her mind between them. Shakespeare however, perceiving the essential clash of emotions and interests, adds the soliloquy to express it. He goes on to resolve the conflict, though Montemayor does not, and in a way that befits Julia's contradictory, constant

¹"Contrarie" occurs three times hereabouts in the novel: p.97, lines 4 and 34 (the instance quoted) and p.99, line 33, cf. IV.iv.79. I believe this is a new suggestion.

nature:

Yet will I woo for him, but yet so coldly
As, heaven it knows, I would not have him speed.
(IV.iv.102-103)

In Julia's interview with Silvia Shakespeare omits the wooing complication. As a result Silvia can reaffirm her constancy, but he wants her to be interested enough in the "page" to ask questions. The opening is deftly engineered, when Julia's ring is rejected by Silvia (line 133) and Julia replies "She thanks you". Silvia's interest is aroused: not however in the "page" himself, only in what he knows of Julia.¹ With that exception, Diana is followed closely for a time in their exchange. Felismena had answered Celia's enquiries thus:

Doest thou then know Felismena (said Celia) the
Lady whom thy Master did once love and serve in
his owne countrey? I know her (saide I) although
not so well as it was needfull for me, to have
prevented so many mishaps, (and this I spake softly
to my selfe). (p.98, lines 34-37)

Compare:

Silvia Dost thou know her?
Julia Almost as well as I do know myself.
(lines 138-139)

The ironies are very close, for both passages suggest that of course "he" knows the lady since "he" is that lady, but also insinuate that the heroine as page has learnt painful truths about herself that as woman she had not known. Felismena ends this part of the passage by flattering Celia's beauty and a few lines of compliment and badinage follow. Shakespeare perhaps found these things trivial: at any rate he does not deviate from pathetic

¹ In the reality, that is, not the appearance.

ironies, for his next four lines are an extension of Montemayor's pathos.

Celia began in good earnest to aske me what manner of woman Felismena was; whom I answered, that touching her beautie, Some thought her to be very faire, but I was never of that opinion, bicause she hath many daies since wanted the chiefest thing, that is requisite for it. What is that said Celia? Content of minde, saide I, bicause perfect beautie can never be, where the same is not adjoyned to it. (p.99, lines 5-12)

Shakespeare makes Silvia's question more specific: "Is she not passing fair?" Again, although Shakespeare's irony is much the same as Felismena's it is less generalized:

She hath been fairer, madam, than she is.
When she did think my master lov'd her well,
She, in my judgment, was as fair as you...
(lines 145-147)

But she adds the witty corollary, that with Proteus' neglect "now she is become as black as I" (line 152). When Silvia asks, "How tall was she?" Julia's answer goes splendidly beyond anything in Montemayor to the rich play on realities in the Whitsun pastorals speech. Here again, and more obviously, Shakespeare is selecting from Diana the pathetic effect he wants and developing it, but completely ignoring its sententiousness. Throughout the exchange Shakespeare selects, concentrates and expands. In the scene as a whole too (Julia's longest) the gentle pathos of Diana is tempered with more spirit and humour, and a clearer articulation of varying viewpoint. The difference can be summed up by saying that Shakespeare's scene does not dwell on a single, static situation but moves about within a complex one.

The Two Gentlemen and Diana have few more points of contact, because in Montemayor Celia dies suddenly of unrequited love for the "page", Felix disappears from Court, and Felismena must wander for more than two years in search of him (p.103). Shakespeare has other plans, for since Silvia does not love "Sebastian" she has no reason to die. But he may be basing Silvia on Celia in one respect: both initiate a series of departures from the court, each one occasioning its successor. If so, he lengthens the series of departures by adding the Duke and Thurio, and adds contrasting motives for pursuing Silvia into the wood. Suspense is also added, since the finale is near: there could be no tension in Diana because the lovers do not meet again for over a hundred pages.

In his finale Shakespeare may have used a few ideas from Diana, but their order, placing and emphasis are changed. For instance, we saw that the final reconciliations are precipitated when a placid scene in the country is violently interrupted and a rescue has to be performed (p.237). Similarly there is a swoon at both climaxes; but in Montemayor it is Felix who faints, not Felismena, and if Shakespeare is recalling Montemayor at all, he is shielding Proteus from the risk of seeming absurd or effeminate. Actually Montemayor is once again using a good idea somewhat indiscriminately: by the time of Felix' swoon (p.239) its possible impact has been diffused, because Celia has died in a swoon (pp.102-103) and Felismena has had a "traunce" at the

moment of recognizing Felix (p.238). Shakespeare has only one swoon, Julia's, and its timing is perfect. The attention of characters and audience, which has been anywhere but on Julia, now centres on her, so that the diversion is total and she can control the last unravellings of the plot. First she produces a ring--the ring which Proteus gave her at betrothal, not the one he is expecting. Economical as ever, Shakespeare is making a last use of this property. Then, when she reveals who she is and points the moral, Shakespeare is reverting for the last time to Montemayor: her narration and Proteus' repentance are however brief and unsentimental compared with what the novel gives to their counterparts.

In these details of incident, language and character can be detected some general tendencies in Shakespeare's use of Diana. Omissions are many, and concern material that he may have found too sensational, sentimental or conventional, or for which he could not make room in this play. In these omissions a strong selectivity has been exercised, and it is equally manifest in the material which he took over. The borrowed material is considerably changed, and there is some consistency in the procedures by which the changes are made. Thus material is often transposed from one character to another, or from one part of the novel to a different part of the play: or something which appears often and unemphatically in the source is used by Shakespeare once and forcefully. Many of the changes amount to additions, which lighten the mood or diversify the point of view. Many additions subserve his char-

acteristic practice of defining by contrast: Proteus is defined by Julia as well as by Valentine, and in a different way by Launce.

The clearest tendency of all however is at the point where structure and characterization merge. Proteus stands near the centre of Shakespeare's structure as Felix in the novel does not. Accordingly he is made more robust in temperament than Felix--he does not swoon or go dumb with grief--and in terms of structure too he is more dominant, being present in more scenes than any other character. The traits which are borrowed from Felix therefore receive more emphasis than in the novel, especially the psychology of betrayal. The frequent variations of perspective which Shakespeare adds are often concentrated upon the helpless inconstancy of this character, for example in the contributions of Launce and Crab (II.iii, IV.iv). On the other hand because Felix is not central to the novel Shakespeare supplements the character of Proteus with material from the friendship story-tradition to make him central.

Conversely the disguised heroine to whom Montemayor gives predominance cannot be predominant in a structure which puts her lover at the centre, especially since a character who is not found in Diana at all (Valentine) must also have a substantial role. But it must be admitted that Julia's personality and adventures are hard to keep out of the centre of one's response to the play: they are as lively as the best other parts of the play, and more lively than much of it. Surely Shakespeare has so

improved upon what was already good that the fertility of the source has caused imbalance. Discussion of the imbalance and its causes must be reserved for later; but suffice it here that Julia is composed largely of traits borrowed or extended from Felismena: fortitude, though it is no longer physical (p.81);¹ perverseness, made more amusing; constancy, made less pathetic; and a more developed capacity to feel sorrows other than her own. In fact Julia is already a distinguished addition to the tradition of sympathetic heroines in whom the comedy of love and sensibility might be developed. Powers which Shakespeare discovers away from the centre of this play later become the centre.

The fourth principal character (Silvia) could be expected to show a similar debt; but because she does not love the disguised heroine in error as Celia does Felismena, the correspondences are slight. She is another sympathetic woman character, with a developed point of view; but it is not the same point of view as Celia's. She shares with Celia nothing specific except the rebuking of her fickle suitor, nor is she based on any friendship tradition, though Valentine is: she resembles neither the unimportant Sophronia nor the deceitful Lucilla. The third contributory tradition provides most for Silvia, namely Brooke's poem, and to this we must turn.

At the level of character Brooke does not contribute much more than Montemayor to Silvia, who is not individualized to

¹Lines 26-33, cf. p.82, lines 19-20.

the extent that Proteus and Julia are. She shows wit in the way she tells Valentine her love for him (in. II. i), and after Proteus begins to intrigue she shows admirable fidelity and resolution; but that is virtually all, since the plot requires of her not development but constancy. If these traits are common to Silvia and to Brooke's Juliet, it may be because they are common to constant heroines: they remain general traits, not as specific as those which are shared by Shakespeare's Juliet with Brooke's.

At the level of incident however Romeus and Juliet supplies more. Shakespeare draws on the poem for the adventures of Valentine and Silvia, from the point at which Proteus begins to intrigue almost until the finale. Before the intrigue he is following the friendship stories and Montemayor, but since he is not following the manner of Euphues' deception he must invent or borrow elsewhere. The intrigue itself is not from Brooke (though Proteus' position as unwelcome suitor has a faint resemblance to that of Paris), nor at the conclusion are the outlaws and the woodland scuffles. Within these limits we find pronounced indebtedness:

the matter of the rope-ladder (II. iv. 178, II. vi. 33-34, III. i. 117-152), the banishment of both Romeus and Valentine, who go, the one actually, the other presumptively (IV. iii. 23, V. ii. 46), to Mantua, the declaration of Valentine to the outlaws that he has killed a man, as Romeus indeed had (IV. i. 26-29), the reaction of Valentine and Romeus to the sentence of banishment and the advice given to them respectively by the Friar and Proteus (III. i. 241-256), the use of a visit to a friar by Silvia and Juliet under the

pretence of confession (IV.iii.43-44, V.ii.40-42), the mention of Friar Laurence in The Two Gentlemen (V.ii.36).¹

Brooke's language too contributes something to the play. Other names besides "Friar Laurence" may come from the poem: "Mercatio" (I.ii.12), "Verona" itself, "Mantua" (V.ii.47) and even "Julia" from "Juliet". The longest and most striking verbal parallel however is between the passages where Romeus and Proteus feel their affections turning from one lady to another:

And whilest he fix'd on her his partiall perced eye,
His former love, for which of late he ready was to dye,
Is nowe as quite forgotte, as it had never been.
The proverbe saith, unminded oft are they that are unseene.
And as out of a planke a nayle a nayle doth drive,
So novell love out of the minde the auncient love doth rive.
This sodain kindled fyre in time is wox so great,
That onely death and both theyr blouds mighte quench the
fiery heate.
(lines 203-210)

Compare:

Even as one heat another heat expels,
Or as one nail by strength drives out another,
So the remembrance of my former love
Is by a newer object quite forgotten.
(II.iv.188-191)

Though the idea is proverbial, as Brooke remarks, there can be little doubt that Shakespeare is recalling Brooke's whole passage. In doing so however he lightens and smooths the expression as he does the metre. Finally it is possible that Brooke's continual insistence on the role of Fortune in the lovers' tragedy,² is

¹C. Leech, New Arden TGV, Introdn., p.xliii. His references to the corresponding passages of Brooke are given in his commentary to the cited passages from TGV. Other parallels are adduced by J.J. Munro in his edition of the poem, Brooke's Romeus and Juliet (Shakespeare Classics), 1908.

²Lines 25, 154, 245, 327, 500, 827, 911 etc., cf. Bullough, I.277.

echoed by Valentine, Romeus' counterpart, as he explains his banishment to the outlaws (IV.1.22 and 43).¹

In spite of their number however these parallels of incident and language are not integral to the design of the play in the way that materials from the other story-traditions are. In the case of language, these are the only verbal parallels of any weight. The place-names at least cause great confusion, since having been under the impression that the two gentlemen set out from Verona to Milan we suddenly hear the friends are in Verona (I.1.57 and III.1.81):² if the use of Brooke has so carried Shakespeare away, the result is not pure gain, nor does any strong poetic evocation of place compensate. And though it may be true that "Valentine's outburst against banishment resembles that in Brooke, and Proteus's hypocritical consolation to him recalls Friar Laurence's to Romeus",³ both speeches are generic and platitudinous. At the level of events therefore and incidental verbal detail Brooke is useful for The Two Gentlemen: at the level of character, theme and structure he is not.⁴

As a whole therefore the combining of story-traditions is ambitious and successful, and local confusions like the geography of the play cannot even cumulatively account for the sense of unevenness which the play generates. The incompatibilities which

¹The concordances list nine references to Fortune for TGV.

²This confusion and the others are set out conveniently in New Arden TGV, pp.xv-xviii.

³Bullough, I.209.

⁴Notwithstanding the profound debt of RJ to the poem. Perhaps his incidental use of Brooke to fill out the action in TGV prompted him to make fuller use in a tragedy, but the inference (though plausible) may be circular.

have generally been felt may in part result from the combination of traditions, but I believe that the chief incompatibilities derive from Shakespeare's use of genre. It is only insofar as the traditions import different conceptions of genre that they contribute incompatibilities. Let us proceed by considering 1) which genres are put to work in the play; 2) what generic materials supplement or interpret material from the story-traditions; and 3) what overall conception of character and event is attempted by means of genre. Then finally we should be in a position to assess the play's coherence.

Romance is the genre most obviously present: since the whole plot hinges on magnanimous friendship and faithful love, there must be an idealizing bent, and many traditional type-situations and properties of the genre are also to be found. "Romance" however is a term that can be interpreted several ways, according to the degree of naivety present or to the proportioning of the four traditional elements. The Two Gentlemen in fact reflects several species of the genre--in part because it combines stories which are themselves romantic in differing degrees and ways: Diana is courtly and pastoral, stories of Friendship Triumphant are classical and exemplary, Euphues is stylish and psychological, Romeus and Juliet is naively tragic. But elements not deriving from specific traditions contribute other romantic tones. The outlaw episodes, which do not correspond with Diana in their manner of mixing courtesy with

violence, owe less to pastoral than to Robin Hood and his rollicking outlawry.¹ Indeed sometimes romance seems to burlesque itself, as in The Old Wives' Tale: Valentine's linguistic ability seems an unlikely, almost frivolous, reason for his election as the outlaws' leader (IV.i.33-35, 56-58).² At other times however the attitude to romance seems more naive than parodic, as in the straightforward knight-errantry of Eglamour (IV.iii, V.i);³ and the multiple settings of the action contain something of wandering romance. Finally besides romance high, low and intrigue comedy are present.

The most plainly generic materials added to the story-traditions concern Valentine's relations with Silvia, which show dependence on the conventions of courtly or Petrarchan love.⁴ At first Valentine resists love (I.i.1-62); when he surrenders he exhibits, while trying to hide, the conventional marks of love (II.i.1-39); he proclaims the worth of his lady, defiantly (II.iv.124-173); he uses religious imagery to describe her (II.iv.125, 141 etc.); and writes verses to her (III.i.140-149). He appears normally to be presented for our approval in these terms,⁵ but at times the artificiality of the conventions is

¹Cf. Bullough, I.207.

²New Arden TGV, p.lx.

³Eglamour and Valentine are named after heroes of chivalric romances, so presumably Shakespeare's characters stand in the same line, unless the naming is obviously ironic. Few have found irony obvious, many have not found it at all.

⁴Cf. Cap.2 above.

⁵Cf. M.C. Bradbrook, Shakespeare and Elizabethan Poetry (Penguin edn.), pp.133-134.

pointed out, as by Speed (II.i.16-36). Since his extremism is certainly vulnerable to criticism from other perspectives, of which Shakespeare is of course including many, but structurally he is the hero throughout, a delicate balance must be struck between his idealism and others' common sense. Silvia is not open to such criticisms because her personality, like her role, is simpler than Valentine's. She can be accepted as the queenly beauty in love, without much qualification, even Crab's activities (IV.iv.1-36) remaining insulated from our view of her. The high-flown language of courtly love would also seem vulnerable, but its treatment varies. Sometimes its use is unqualified, as when Valentine declares, "I have done penance for contemning Love" (II.iv.125). Sometimes its unrestrained use, which could seem frigid, is placed as such by the comments of other characters as when Proteus taxes Valentine with "braggardism" (II.iv.160), or is exploited consciously by the speaker, as when Proteus instructs Thurio in the language required of suitors (III.ii.66-88).

These romance materials have a primarily local importance, but the play owes a good deal to the larger-scale elements discussed in our previous chapter. Adventures of course are plentiful: the foiled elopement, the banishment, Silvia's escape, and the greenwood episodes. Marvels are more closely related to the experience of love than these adventures, so too is the "wonder" on which along with fortune the play closes:

Please you, I'll tell you as we pass along,
That you will wonder what hath fortun'd.

(V.iv.168-169)

Yet these romance ideas are conceived naively, without profundity, and the same is true of the use of setting. It looks back to wandering romances which

[change] their locality more than once, not usually for the sake of a special significance in the fresh locality (the forest in The Two Gentlemen being a place of convenient meeting rather than the place where magic is done in A Midsummer Night's Dream...), but in order that the characters may ultimately find their way to a sorting out of their tangled patterns of life.¹

Several suggestions from the sources are pretermitted as a result. Friendship Triumphant is placed in Athens and Rome, Euphuus in Athens and Naples,² Romeus in Verona, the tale of Felismena in town and court with many pastoral episodes. Our play takes little from the first three, and though the pattern of movement corresponds most closely to that of Diana it does not absorb its pastoralism, apart from the movement into the greenwood for resolution of its love-problems, and Valentine's brief meditation (V.iv.1 ff.).

Love on the other hand not only receives the expected primacy, but is presented with some variety. The high, honourable love of Valentine is set off by the disruptive infatuation of Proteus, the inconsistent constancy of Julia by the garrulous secrecy of Launce. Once more the pattern is largely determined by the mood of its story-ingredients, so that for example Julia owes much more to Felismena than to the genre as such; yet devices are drawn from the genre to supplement these materials. The

¹ New Arden TGV, p.lviii.

² Athens and Rome particularly are locations of dignity, which Shakespeare elsewhere exploited.

unspecified "messages, letters, and gifts that were brought and carried on both sides" in Diana (p.94, lines 30-31) are turned into the letter and ring which Proteus sends Silvia and the picture she sends to him. Each is dexterously handled so that it produces stage business and illumination of character.¹ In addition the exchange of gifts is treated satirically when we learn that Launce has offered Silvia Crab as a lapdog (IV.iv.50). Most of these devices, however, especially the record number of stage letters, are properties of intrigue drama as well as of romance, and it is difficult at times to ascribe them to one rather than the other. It is perhaps unnecessary since romance and intrigue have a number of elements in common.

Sens, where the two may seem to have least in common, is not an exception, because though pure intrigue² need not involve feeling or individuality of character, its strong patterning of relationships can easily be made to serve a serious exploration of motive. The Two Gentlemen may partly owe its conception to intrigue models, for Proteus' attempt to manipulate Valentine, the Duke, Thurio and Silvia for his own ends is an intrigue, just as particular incidents like the exposure of Valentine's plan to elope with Silvia recall comedies of intrigue. Even the design of two complementary pairs of lovers may, in its symmetry, owe something to intrigue. Nevertheless the themes owe more to

¹ H. Jenkins, "Shakespeare's Twelfth Night", p.34.

² "Intrigue" is more closely defined in the context of plays where its presence is more potent: see for example below Caps. 4 on CE, 8 on MW and 10 on TN.

romance, and its ability to concentrate on emotions for their own sake which intrigue seldom shows. Thus romance contributes to the portrayal of Proteus' infidelity; the "delighted evocation of female wilfulness" in Julia,¹ developing through the pathos of disguise into self-knowledge; and Valentine's deep sense of betrayal (V.iv.62-72). As the recurrences of these situations in later plays testify Shakespeare has discovered some of his most powerful themes in The Two Gentlemen.

What overall conception of character and event do these generic materials serve? Here is the crux. The play goes in several different directions, has not one consistent tone. It is not that low-life incidents, or laughter at the expense of a protagonist, in themselves prove uncertainty of purpose in the dramatist. Romance can accommodate such things, but only if they are handled aright; and this is what our discussion of generic materials has tacitly questioned. Are we to take the outlaws seriously, as an irruption of violence, or are they burlesque? Is Sir Eglamour the truly disinterested chivalric knight we first hear of (IV.iii), or a coward exposed when danger comes (V.iii.7)? It will not prove consistency of purpose either if he is regarded as a mere piece of machinery, to get Silvia away from court and into the outlaws' clutches. More seriously, Valentine's extreme obedience to courtly conventions makes him not merely vulnerable to criticism but open to ridicule,

¹G.K. Hunter, John Lyly, pp.313, cf. 312 and 337-338.

since even his servant has more perception than he. His surprisingly sly advice to the Duke (III.i.58-134) makes sense in itself, because the deceiver is being deceived in the exchange, but is not harmonized with any other behaviour of Valentine's. Similarly at the end he swings from his most heartfelt speech (V.iv.62-72), in which personal feeling is present for the first time, to the renunciation of Silvia, which is a striking gesture but not personal. When Valentine is confined to the postures of conventional love and friendship he is wooden: when he departs from them he is puzzling. The delicate balance that varied perspectives require has not been achieved.

That these are incoherences is clear from the coherence of so much else in the play. Of the other three principals Silvia's is a strong though simple character: because she does not change her mind no subtlety is needed. Proteus, whose double change of heart is demanded by the structure, requires much more explanation of motive, and since he receives it he is one of the strong points of the play. Julia, who changes her costume but not her nature, requires some attention if she is to play her disguise role; but thanks to Felismena she is given far more motivation—at all stages of the story—than is necessary for a character who affects the central intrigue hardly at all. The lightening of perspective with Launce is also clear in purpose and succeeds. But success in these areas exposes the jejune treatment of Valentine and the outlaws. There is in fact no overall conception of character and event. The sheer variety of characterization and incident

which the romance form accommodates seems to hinder a full unification of the play's heterogeneous elements—some of romance, some not, some primitive (in the pejorative sense), some sophisticated. The play seems to exist simultaneously at several stages of the development in romance which was traced in Chapter Two; or to put it another way the variousness of romance has not yet been brought under control, so that one is still as much aware of its dangers as of its opportunities.

One's final impression of The Two Gentlemen cannot however be adverse. Not only is its design structurally strong, indeed elegant, and not only does it uncover rich materials in the sources and the genre, which are locally successful: it is so fertile in large-scale use of romance that, far from being poor compared with Shakespeare's other early comedies, it is at least as important to his development as they are. Among the experimental early group of comedies it relies most on romance, the point of greatest growth for all the comedies we are studying. The force of this impression will be seen now as we examine a comedy which has a different relationship to the genre: The Comedy of Errors, in which farcical intrigue is prior to romance.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE COMEDY OF ERRORS: INTRIGUE ROMANTICIZED

Shakespeare's inclination to combine moods and genres, which is not under perfect control in The Two Gentlemen, is more satisfactorily exercised in The Comedy of Errors, where we find a sophisticated combination of intrigue and farce¹ with romance. As before however source-study can best begin with the story-sources and their traditions,² after which it will be possible to assess how the design is shaped and supplemented by generic materials.

Pride of place must be given to Plautus' Menaechmi, whose story of the Twins in Town gave Shakespeare much the largest part of his story and situations. As was argued in Chapter One, he probably read it in a Latin version, but since in any case verbal indebtedness is slight it is not imperative to decide which version he knew. It is rather more valuable to place Errors among other

¹"Farce" and "intrigue" are current in several senses, often overlapping. I use them in the following senses almost exclusively: "farce" as "low-level humour, notably physical knockabout"; and "intrigue" as "actions which characters perform when attempting to control events--actions which, however improbable, follow rigorously from premises of the plot, and which presuppose human appetites but exclude complexities of feeling." It will be observed that "farce" could also connote something of this sense of "intrigue" (cf. E.K. Chambers, Shakespeare: A Survey, 1925, but referred to in Pelican reprint, 1964, p.30), but for the sake of clarity overlap is avoided; also that in Errors, though not in Shakespeare's other intrigue plays, no character actually does control the outcome, since all the manipulating is done by events or fate; and finally that the influence of intrigue on Shakespeare may derive from Roman New Comedy or from its descendants, the *Commedia Erudita*, *Commedia dell'Arte* or English Plautine dramas.

²The Menaechmi (Latin text and English trn.) is referred to in the Loeb Classical Library edn. of P. Nixon, Plautus, Vol. II, of 5 Vols., 1917, usually by page, line and scene numbers. The Amphitruo of Plautus is referred to in the same edn., Vol. I, 1916, and in the same manner. Reference to the story of Apollonius of Tyre is to a number of texts, which it will be more convenient to list below.

Renaissance treatments of Menaechmi, whether or not Shakespeare himself knew them; but fullest discussion must still be given to Menaechmi itself, unquestionably the main source. With the subsidiary stories the case is different. It is usually held that the exclusion of Antipholus of Ephesus and his servant from his own house is modelled on Plautus' Amphitruo, where Jupiter and Mercury masquerade as Amphitryon and his servant and brazenly exclude those whom they impersonate;¹ but because Menaechmi itself presents the exclusion of one twin from dinner, it does not seem essential to find a source for the doubling of the exclusion. May not Shakespeare himself have invented it? In any event it is perhaps more profitably studied against a wider background, the story-tradition of imposture. Equally for the story of the twins' parents we cannot say which of many versions Shakespeare knew best, but the tradition as a whole affords an illuminating perspective.

It will be convenient to consider the three story-traditions in turn, noting especially shared elements which could have led Shakespeare to combine them, before giving to Menaechmi the more extended discussion it invites.

Menaechmi was popular in Renaissance Italy, whether in Latin or the vernacular, faithfully followed or freely adapted. It was performed in England at Cambridge in 1551/2 and 1565/6 and at Oxford in 1567/8.² We hear nothing of translations until

¹M.W. Wallace, The Birthe of Hercules, Chicago, 1903, p.89 calls the correspondence "practically perfect"; but it seems to me imperfect, and (crucially) isolated.

²F.S. Boas, University Drama in the Tudor Age, Oxford, 1914, pp.18,109.

Errors and the version of W.W., unless two lost plays, The historie of Error played by Paul's in 1577 and A historie of fferrar played by Sussex's Men in 1583,¹ bear some relation to Menaechmi or Errors, which they need not. We may therefore credit Shakespeare (at least until further evidence becomes available) with first seeing that this play of Plautus, like others worked over by his predecessors or contemporaries, could be the model for an English comedy.

It was a short play (1162 lines), so that Shakespeare would have to expand it to a length more like that to which Elizabethan audiences were accustomed (a necessity which might be rather beneficial than otherwise). His expansions sometimes correspond to those of his Italian predecessors. In the first place he transfers the information supplied in the Latin by Argument and Prologue to the first scene; Trissino in I Simillimi (1547) had done the same thing, declaring that he had "taken out the Prologue, and...given the narrative of the Argument to the first persons who speak in the play."² Nor was Shakespeare the first to think of giving the task of exposition to the twins' father.³ Secondly Renaissance writers tended to begin the intrigue action much sooner than Plautus had done: thus W.W. reduces the length of the first act, in which the confusion has not begun, by about a third, and Shakespeare too embroils the visiting twin in mistakes at the earliest opportunity (I.ii.41). Thirdly, although such compression might seem to work against

¹E.K. Chambers, William Shakespeare, I.308-309.

²Quoted by Bullough, I.6.

³Ibid., I.10.

the tendency to expand Menaechmi the adapters suffered no lack of material to add. We have already seen that the twins' father was sometimes added, and many versions gave more prominence to the resident twin's wife. The additions by no means stopped here, indeed there was a tendency to complicate Plautus much further: Cecchi in La Dote adds four old men,¹ and gives the twins a sister, while Aretino in the Ipocrito gives one of the twins five daughters.² Shakespeare's play shows something of the same tendency since he too increased the wife's part, included both the twins' parents, gave the wife a sister, and each twin a servant. Yet not all these changes were made simply to complicate the intrigue: the invention of the Dromios certainly was, but Luciana serves other purposes, and Emilia hardly furthers the intrigue at all—a small indication already that though Shakespeare's design begins from Plautine purposes it will include others.

Some of those purposes are thematic. Though we might not expect Shakespeare to owe much to an intrigue play in this respect he does in fact extend a minor thematic development in the tradition, the point being clearest in the titles of the plays. Plautus' plays tend to be named after specific characters or objects in them, as in "Menaechmi" itself, or "Rudens" ("The Rope"), "Captivi" or "Aulularia" ("The Pot"); but some titles describe rather than name their central personalities, for instance "Miles Gloriosus" ("The Boastful Soldier"), or "Asinaria" ("The Play about Asses"). This

¹Quoted by Bullough, I.7.

²M.T. Herrick, Italian Comedy in the Renaissance, Urbana, 1960, pp.95 ff. and 165-166.

last is perhaps Plautus' nearest approach to a thematic title. Italian writers in the Plautine manner seem to prefer descriptive to naming titles, like "I Suppositi" ("The Substituted Ones") of Ariosto, or "Gli Duoi Fratelli Rivali" of de Nores, and the tendency certainly applies to plays connected with Menaechmi, such as Trissino's "I Simillimi" ("Those Who Are Very Alike"), Cecchi's "La Moglie" ("The Wife") or Giancarli's "La Cingana" ("The Gipsy Woman"). This would be in accord with the analytical, abstracting bent of contemporary Plautus scholars, like Lambinus whose commentary on Menaechmi (1576) pointed out the errores or mistakes as they occurred.¹ English plays in the Plautine manner took the tendency further. Gascoigne's version of I Suppositi (1566) shows it from both points of view, because his title "Supposes" refers to structure, or even theme, where Ariosto's title had not, and because he adds footnotes to his text pointing out the "Supposes" as they occur. Indeed he coined the very word to explain, and call attention, to what he was doing. The same kind of analysis is to be found in W.W.'s translation, which concludes the Argument in words not based on Plautus' Argument:

Father, wife, neighbours, each mistaking either,
Much pleasant error, ere they meete together.²

Whichever of these prompted Shakespeare's title, it clearly stands in the same line, for towards the end he alludes to his own title:

¹New Arden CE, Introdn., p.xxviii, cf. T.W. Baldwin, Five-Act Structure, pp.691 ff.

²Bullough, I.13, the whole trn. being reprinted *ibid.* (pp.12-39).

I see we still did meet each other's man
 And I was ta'en for him, and he for me,
 And thereupon these ERRORS are arose.¹
 (V.i.385-387)

Yet Shakespeare's title and allusions, unlike Gascoigne's, do more than emphasize his chief comic device and suggest a mood: errors are not merely amusing, they are evidence of the graver preoccupations which Shakespeare adds to the tradition. When Antipholus of Syracuse says to Luciana

Teach me, dear creature, how to think and speak;
 Lay open to my earthy-gross conceit,
 Smoth'ered in errors, feeble, shallow, weak,
 The folded meaning of your words' deceit.
 (III.ii.33-36)

Shakespeare is clearly just as concerned with the feelings of those who are in error as with its incidence and multiplication.

It is this pathos, as much as the exclusions of Antipholus and Amphitryon, which links the tradition of Amphitruo with Errors. Though the tradition of Menaechmi presents what seems to be deceit but is really error and the tradition of Amphitruo presents what seems to be error but is really deceit, they are related at deeper levels. Mistakes and impostures both involve their victims in fear: the fear of being supplanted in one's status, indeed of losing one's identity. This dread is not prominent in the Menaechmi tradition before Shakespeare, anger rather than fear being aroused; but it is common in imposture stories. It is found in the Amphitruo itself (I.i, Sosia's reactions, and IV.ii, Amphitryon's); in the tale of King Jovinian in the Gesta Romanorum;² and in the many

¹The capitals are those of the editor, P. Alexander, of course; they do not appear in the First Folio.

²Story LIX in the edn. of Swan and Hooper (1876), pp.100 ff.

tales of Doppelgänger and sinister doubles. It is natural therefore for Amphitryon and his servant to attribute their exclusion from bed and board to sorcery.¹ Whereas Amphitryon's house rightly seems to its owner a place of dangerous metamorphosis, Antipholus of Syracuse mistakenly interprets Ephesus as such a place. In developing mistaken accusations of witchcraft (which are not from Menaechmi, where the anticipated dangers of the town are all moral ones²) Shakespeare uses material from Ephesians as well, to amplify the visiting twin's horror by means of

...worse perils than the law's in Ephesus, suggested
by its repute as a place of illusions and shape-
shifting,...of

Dark-working sorcerers that change the mind:
Soul-killing witches that deform the body.
The lines seize the imagination of the audience at
the deep level where the ancient dread of losing
the self or soul is very much alive.³

Further confirmation that the Twins' Story is being treated more gravely than in Menaechmi can be found in the way Shakespeare uses his third story-tradition, the story of a parent's quest for a long-lost child. As H.F. Brooks remarks (pp.64-65), this story is only a presupposition of the plot of Menaechmi, but now it is extended into the frame-plot of Egeon by the combination of many scraps of incident. Egeon's initial peril is a translation into fact, and an intensification, of the situation which appears to threaten the Sienese merchant in Gascoigne's Supposes (II.i); but otherwise the tribulations of the twins' father should be

¹I.48, lines 455-462, I.i and I.110, lines 1039-44, IV.ii.

²See New Arden CE commentary on I.ii.97-102 (p.18).

³H.F. Brooks, "Themes and Structure in CE", p.60, and cf. New Arden CE, p.xlvi.

related to an older story-tradition, that of Apollonius of Tyre.¹ The earlier adventures of Apollonius, at the court of the cruel Antiochus, are not used for Errors (though the whole story is used for Pericles), but once Apollonius has married there are a number of elements shared with Shakespeare's frame-plot. There is a terrible storm while the couple are at sea, which causes their long separation: the context involves the birth of their child. Later there is a further separation, of the father from his child (this separation being in part voluntary), and the father becomes increasingly dejected. Yet after long vicissitudes all the separated members of the family—three in the Apollonius tradition, four in Errors—are reunited. The child, who has been captured by pirates (another element which Shakespeare borrowed, although he transferred it to his elaborately narrated shipwreck), comes to a town where she eventually meets her father. Meanwhile the wife, who was thought to have died in labour and was buried at sea, survives and becomes a priestess at Ephesus. To Ephesus finally come her husband and daughter, and the recognitions take place in her temple. I have not stressed the differences between the tradition

¹This story is thought to have its original in a Hellenistic novel. There are about a hundred medieval Latin MS versions, the earliest being from the ninth century. A well-known version of the twelfth century is that of Godfrey of Viterbo in his Pantheon, and another is that in the Gesta Romanorum (No. CLIII, pp.259-299 in Swan and Hooper); but both come to be overshadowed by Gower's retelling in the Confessio Amantis (Bk. VIII). Among later versions are the ones by Belleforest (Le Septiesme Tome des Histoires Tragiques, Lyons, 1595, Histoire Troisième) and Laurence Twine (The Pattern of Painful Adventures, S.R., 1576). The tradition is surveyed, and the story conveniently summarized, by E.H. Haight, "Apollonius of Tyre and Shakespeare's Pericles Prince of Tyre" in More Essays on Greek Romances, New York, 1945, pp.142-189. See also Bullough, VI.349-374 (re PPT), F.D. Hoeniger's Introduction to the New Arden edn. of PPT, 1963, pp.xiii-xix.

and Shakespeare's use of it for Errors since they are sufficiently obvious and are usually occasioned by the need to conform to the plot-lines of Menæchmi, (as when twin sons replace a single daughter, or when the unities of place and time are substituted for the wanderings of the old romance).

Yet though the borrowing of incident and story-line is important, it is equally important that Shakespeare takes over from the tale of Apollonius a certain gravity of tone, and even something like a philosophy. The gravity stems from the accumulated trials which are heaped upon the long-suffering protagonist, and of course Egeon expresses the pathos of his hard lot, as the play commences and immediately before the anagnorises. The borrowed philosophy is however also of some interest.

Primarily it is a romantic world-view, in which the hero survives many adventures, achieves his quest for home and family, and all ends happily: so Twine called his version "The Pattern of Painful Adventures", and Belleforest described his as "*Accidens divers aduenus à Appolonie Roie des Tyriens: ses malheurs sur mer, ses pertes de femme et fille, et la fin heureuse de tous ensemble.*"¹ Secondly however the story is a tale of recovery and return, a Nostos-myth. It has many features in common with the Odyssey. Not only are there the Mediterranean wanderings, with danger, storm and shipwreck, but the strong emphasis on the hero's endurance of suffering, so often singled out in Homer as Odysseus' leading trait;

¹Quoted by Steevens, himself quoted in the Gesta Romanorum, ed. Swan and Hooper, p.411.

and the overarching pattern of loss and recovery, the return to a wife and child and the succession of poignant recognitions, themselves made arduous by so many years of separation. Thirdly the mention of Odysseus suggests that the two tales have in common not only a Greek setting and a narrative shape, but pre-Christian elements of meaning, notably the influential role usually assigned to fate or fortune, and the admiration of man's stoical endurance of what these hostile or indifferent powers ordain. Finally however since fate and fortune are often mentioned in Christian contexts, and especially in romances, it is no surprise to find that some versions of the tale of Apollonius give it a Christian interpretation. For instance Gower in the Confessio Amantis¹ says not only "Al that schal falle, falle schal" (line 1172) but also "That god wol save mai noght spille" (line 1160). A similar apparent contradiction occurs later on, when Apollonius' wife serves the goddess of Ephesus, more or less accurately named "Diane" (line 1269), as her "Abbesse" (line 1849). The contradiction however is not troublesome, because it is clear enough that Christian writers of romance, especially those with a moralizing bent, make the theologically neutral "fate" or "fortune" into a Christian providence. As K. Muir says of Pericles, the wheel of fortune is converted into the wheel of Providence.²

The versions of the story-tradition vary as to incidents and interpretation, but share a core of incident and theme, and

¹ Relevant extracts are printed by Bullough (I.50-54).

² Shakespeare as Collaborator, 1960, p.83, cf. Bullough, VI.372.

elicit a basically similar response. The great variety of incidents in this wandering romance amount in sum to a pattern of losing and finding, in which after long sufferings the family is reunited. Yet something else has never been lost, namely the integrity of the central figure,¹ echoed and ratified in the solemn joy which concludes the story—the "gaudium sempiternum" of the heading to the Gesta Romanorum version.² This joy connotes wonder too: thus Gower speaks of the "gret merveille" (line 1158)—this is the language of romance—and, at the end, of the "miracle" (line 1867), where the language is more explicitly religious. Errors in its own way shows a similar evolution, for whereas Egeon at first ascribes his troubles to "the gods" and "fortune" (I.i.99 and 106) we hear later of a Priory, not a temple of Diana (V.i.37). So too Emilia's final invitation to a general thanksgiving feast speaks only in passing of "our fortunes" (V.i.394) and much more specifically of a "gossips' feast" (line 404); that is, a baptismal celebration. Moreover she is an Abbess, one who has already reproved Adriana's deviation from the pattern of a Christian wife, and who has introduced a relieving note of sanctity into the brawling confusion of the epistas.³ Finally, by placing the whole of his action in the city where the story of Apollonius has its climax but not its origins, Shakespeare can exploit Ephesus' sacred associations, owed to St. Paul's letter to the Ephesians.

¹A similar combination of suffering and integrity is suggested by part of the story's title in the Gesta Romanorum, "Of Temporal Tribulation".

²The full title reads: De tribulacione temporalī, que in gaudium sempiternum postremo commutabitur, New Arden PPT, p.xvii.

³Cf. New Arden CE, p.xlviii, Bullough, I.11.

All in all Shakespeare's play owes a good deal of its seriousness to borrowings from the story of Apollonius.¹ Though the play will frequently be farcical, it can never become wholly so because of the sombre key in which Egeon's plight makes it begin. The main effect upon Errors as a whole of framing the twins' story within their parents' story is greatly to heighten the pathos which was only latent in situations of Menaechmi. Pathos in fact is one of the main qualities shared by all three story-traditions which go to the making of Errors.

Pathos however is not merely present in all three traditions; it is present because they share common themes. The most important of these is again error. "Error" in Latin connotes not only "mistake" but also "wandering", and both senses are woven into the verbal texture of the play. Not only does Egeon himself make mistakes (in entering Ephesus, and in greeting the wrong son), but he wanders patiently in search (I.i.133 ff); conversely the visiting twin who provokes mistakes by others is also a wanderer (I.ii.35-40). "Wandering" in fact is made a metaphor, or synonym, for error itself;

Against my soul's pure truth why labour you
To make it wander in an unknown field?
(III.ii.37-38)

The multiple perspective on Error, and the combination of stories which produce it, intensify what is central to the play, both as a comic device and main theme.

Intensification by means of multiplication and combination is found as well, though on a smaller, less thematic scale, in Shake-

¹ Perhaps also to such kindred stories as Rudens (see New Arden CE, p.xxxii), Supposes and Greene's Menaphon.

spere's use of Menaechmi as main story-source. In the direct comparison of Errors with Menaechmi which follows we must ourselves preserve a double perspective, since Errors depends on its source more than any other comedy, until The Merchant, depends on a main source,¹ and yet simultaneously makes continual alterations, omissions and additions. Its dependence is creative.

The use of incident is discussed before characterization because it determines structure, which in turn determines character, and because Shakespeare's debt is greatest for the story-line of Errors. Even so alteration is immediately revealed. It takes a form we shall find to be frequent in his retelling of Menaechmi, namely transposition. Thus whereas the first act of Menaechmi concerns the resident twin and the second concerns his travelling brother,² Shakespeare's Traveller takes over the stage from Egeon and remains the centre of interest during Act II. The main effect of this change is to begin the mistakes much sooner, but its other effects are also important. In the first place Egeon's tale emphasizing loss, separation and search is continued, though in a lower key, with the melancholy yearnings of Antipholus of Syracuse.

¹ Provided that one accepts the chronology outlined in Cap.1, and that one leaves TS out of account, its relationship to A Shrew being so obscure.

² It is a problem how to refer to the twins, both pairs, without confusion. The method usually adopted here is to refer to Menaechmus Sosicles and Antipholus of Syracuse as "the Traveller" and Menaechmus Civiis and Antipholus of Ephesus as "the Citizen", the context showing whether a Menaechmus or an Antipholus is meant. Where there is no chance of confusion "Antipholus" or "Menaechmus" will be admissible; where the risk of confusion is greatest the full version is given, "Antipholus of Syracuse/Ephesus" or "Menaechmus Sosicles/Civiis". Other descriptions, such as "Antipholus Surreptus" or "Menaechmus Advena", are avoided.

If his established, burgher brother had taken over from Egeon the romantic mood might have been dissipated, but he is not seen until Act III. Secondly the inversion of Plautus' order of presentation is part of a consistently greater emphasis on the twin who is a stranger, which makes for more mistakes but also for more attention to feeling. Another change contributes to both these aims. Whereas the detail of Act I of Menaechmi concerns the Citizen's relations with three stock characters of Roman New Comedy--the Parasite, the Courtesan and the Wife, the last-named being the least important,--the first four scenes of Errors concern the other twin's relations with the Citizen's wife and her household: the Parasite is omitted almost entirely and the Courtesan appears only in Acts IV and V. In fact all that Shakespeare uses of Menaechmi Act I is a few traits for the Wife's character: everything else is jettisoned.

Shakespeare's treatment of the Wife and the Courtesan illustrates a second type of transposition, in which Plautine material is transferred from one character to another. Most obviously the dinner which is eaten by the wrong twin and from which the right twin is excluded is now given by Adriana. This exclusion will be considered shortly, but the transpositions begin well before that climax. The scenes which precede it (I.ii., II.i and II.ii) have no other function, in terms of plot, than to get the dinner invitation accepted by the wrong Antipholus--a function fulfilled also by Act II of Menaechmi. Yet by transposition and expansion Shakespeare makes his scenes more complicated and amusing, and also more revealing of Adriana's character

and relationships. First, since it is Adriana who offers the dinner, she must offer the invitations. But as a result of this change Shakespeare can create additional eddies of confusion, for while retaining the pattern by which the lady herself persuades where her emissary has just failed, he makes this emissary the Citizen's Dromio. The result is a beating for both Dromios, one for inviting, the other for denying that he had done so (I.ii.92, II.ii.23).¹ A second source of complication arises from the inclusion of Luciana (II.i and ii) who helps to enlarge the pattern of personalities and misapprehensions forming round the dinner. She does this in two ways: first in a conversation with Adriana which allows Shakespeare to suggest the Citizen's temperament and create suspense around his imminent entry; and second in the love she arouses in the other Antipholus, a cause of yet further complication and misapprehension.

As a result, when the exclusion scene itself comes, it coincides with the first appearance of the resident Antipholus and his entourage: each enhances the other, and both are enhanced by the lively sense of characters and relationships which Shakespeare (overgoing Plautus) has created.

Further transpositions are made by Shakespeare in presenting the results of the dinner, though the dinner is of course eaten by the wrong twin in both plays. In Plautus Act III shows the Traveller congratulating himself on his opportunism, and receiving in addition to

¹ Money causes similar bewilderment. Whereas nothing comes in Plautus of the Traveller's fears for his money (II.i, II.iii, V.i), Shakespeare makes Antipholus' alarm more justifiable and more extreme; he beats Dromio of Ephesus for denying knowledge of his money (I.ii.92) yet later is embarrassed by the gold given him by his own Dromio, of which he knows nothing (IV.iii.12 ff.).

his entertainment a cloak and a bracelet from the Courtezan. Only in Act IV do we see the effects on his brother, who is browbeaten and shut out—first by his wife and then by Erotium. Shakespeare however shifts our attention from the dinner to the exclusion: no sooner has the Traveller gone in to dine than we meet the intended recipient. The timing is surely superior. Moreover the mistakes arising over the chain and the ring, which have a similar function to Plautus' mistakes arising over the bracelet and the cloak, are held over until Act IV: not only would they spoil the timing of the Citizen's exclusion here, but since they contribute to the mounting chaos of Acts IV and V they belong at least as properly there. Consequently although it is always difficult to be as sure of Shakespeare's intentions as of his effects, it may be suggested that he deliberately brought forward the exclusion¹ and held back the main mistakes over property in order that the exclusion rather than the dinner might usher in another round of mistakes, and constitute the first climax of the play.

The exclusion scene of Errors unmistakably is a climax: it is the first occasion when errors of identity produce a major conflict of interests and persons. In Menaechmi the effect is somewhat dispersed, because conflict has begun earlier when the Parasite is disowned by the Traveller (III.ii), and because the exclusion is doubled, the Wife and the Courtezan successively barring their doors against the Citizen (IV.ii and iii). Doubling is not necessarily a weakness, of course, but in this case it does

¹ It occurs about a third of the way through CE, just before halfway in Menaechmi.

seem to be, since the three clashes of interest are all on one level of intensity. Shakespeare's exclusion on the other hand is single and powerful. For one thing he ignores the Parasite and the Courtezan to concentrate on the clash between husband and wife, for which the debate on marriage between the sisters has prepared (II.i), and which in the nature of things will cause more profound confusion than clashes involving the two more superficial relationships. Moreover the conflict is aggravated by the addition of witnesses and minor participants: instead of two or three individuals Shakespeare presents two full groups. The door is guarded by Dromio of Syracuse while Luce and Adriana are also heard; and Antipholus of Ephesus is attended on stage by three companions in deprivation, his own Dromio, Angelo and Balthazar. There are exchanges within the groups as well as between them. Most of the principals are within shouting distance, yet because the two groups cannot see each other the conflict is not only not resolved but exacerbated.

The exacerbation in turn gives the action further momentum; in fact it brings confusion nearer violence, by a smoothly contrived acceleration of confusion. For this Shakespeare owes much to his theatrical sense, but a little initially to Menaechmi. In the Latin play the Citizen is shut out by his wife because of a cloak he has stolen from her, and by the Courtezan because of a bracelet¹ which she imagines she entrusted to him, although actually she has given it to his twin. In Errors the cloak is replaced as a ground of marital dis-

¹The Latin word is "spinter", II.416, line 527 (III.iii). As W.W. renders it "chain" Shakespeare might be following him (or vice versa), but coincidence is also possible, cf. New Arden CE, II.i.106, n.

cord by a chain, probably derived from the bracelet; the Citizen intends to give it to his wife, but, angered by his exclusion, he promises it to the Courtezan instead. She means to give him a ring in return, but the Traveller receives it by mistake. Though the transposition of the chain and the addition of the ring may seem insignificant changes, it is worth seeing in some detail the differences of effect they create, both immediately after the exclusion and in the sequel: they suggest some of the force of what Shakespeare in his rehandling of Menaechmi habitually adds.

The chain assists the developing action in several ways. It complicates matters splendidly, since though it changes hands only once,¹ as in Menaechmi, it involves the expectations and relationships of many more characters. Adriana desires the chain, the Citizen cheats her of it from spite, and the Courtezan also awaits it; yet none of them actually receives it. Angelo expects payment for it; and his creditor expects to recover a debt from it; but neither is paid. The Traveller on the other hand, who does not want it (unlike his opportunistic original), does receive it, to his subsequent embarrassment. Secondly the chain identifies the Traveller for the audience at the time of greatest confusion, in which they too might otherwise become bewildered.² Thirdly the pattern of surprises, in which some get more, some less, than they expect, leads to a disruption of relationships, personal or commercial, in which

¹When Angelo gives it to Antipholus of Syracuse (III.ii.163 ff.).

²This might be among Shakespeare's reasons for changing the bracelet into the more visible chain.

the characters reveal more and more of their natures: Adriana lacks material greed, though the chain may have symbolic connotations of possessiveness;¹ the Courtezan however is greedy; the Citizen is irascible yet credit-worthy; Angelo is trusting; and the Traveller is impressionable and easy to alarm. The chain therefore has an effect beyond the aggravation of intrigue confusion that is its primary effect: it reaches also towards characterization, which at this point of the play we can see is undergoing some development--less than in other comedies of Shakespeare perhaps, but more than in Menaechmi.

Though the ring is mentioned less than the chain it too has a significant function, not only for the intrigue but for character and theme. For the intrigue the ring makes worse the misunderstandings between Adriana and her husband, by means moreover of someone who has not been seen before--the Courtezan. As for character, when she goes to complain to Adriana about her husband's "theft" of the ring,² she is distinguished from them by her greed (IV.iii.78-79, 90-91) but united with them in excitability: she speaks of Antipholus' madness, rage, fits, and wild larceny. It is her exaggerations which begin the diagnosis of the Citizen's odd behaviour as madness, and the diagnosis not only precipitates violence in the intrigue but epitomizes Shakespeare's stress upon error as a source of feeling as well as of incident.

¹J.R. Brown, Shakespeare and his Comedies, 1957, p.54.

²Shakespeare adds the usual bawdy pun here, cf. New Arden MV, ed. J.R. Brown, V.i.307, n.(p.139).

Once madness has been emphasized as a result of the ring, Shakespeare draws once more on Plautus. Both authors have prepared for such an emphasis towards the catastrophe by earlier, milder accusations of insanity. Thus when the Courtezan's cook by mistake invites the Traveller to dinner, each thinks the other's inexplicable language is a sign of madness (II.ii); then the Traveller thinks the Courtezan herself must be mad or drunk (II.iii). Shakespeare's introduction of the theme is basically similar, but more careful: the accusations are kept minor, so that the Courtezan's diagnosis can have a decisive effect on a deteriorating situation. As R.A. Foakes says:

There has been talk of madness previously (cf. II.i.59, II.ii.11, III.ii.53, etc.), but chiefly between master and servant in jest, or in private conversation; it is part of a growing extension of private misunderstanding into public disorder that the Courtesan should seriously think Antipholus mad, and act on it...¹

The vital word here is "public". As confusion is spread by the chain and the ring, a greater number of people than in Menaechmi are disposed to think each other mad; and because the suspicion is first expressed by an outsider, who appears to the Citizen's household to be disinterested, it carries more conviction. Therefore it can do more harm than we find in Menaechmi, where the suspicion of madness originates with the Traveller's accusation of the Wife (V.i).

Because Shakespeare has intensified the theme of madness

¹New Arden CE, IV.iii.78, n.

by introducing it earlier, more often and more privately, and by more clearly marking its transition to the public world, he can go on to intensify it gradually to a more violent outcome. Yet Plautus' final act is also good, and its merits greatly assisted him. After Menaechmus the Traveller has diagnosed the Wife's incomprehensible railings as madness, she and her father decide that because he disowns them he must be mad.¹ Next, by a clever touch that Shakespeare does not use, the Traveller pretends actually to be mad, in order to drive them away: he performs so well that they go to fetch a doctor and servants to bind him. Misunderstandings accumulate when the doctor and his men try to bind Menaechmus the Citizen, who is then rescued by Messenio under the impression that their victim is his master the Traveller. There is a certain amount of violence on stage here, though it is mostly at the level of scuffling and knocks.

Of these elements Shakespeare retains the Wife's concern, the scene in which the "lunatic" scares her, the binding of the Citizen and his escape. Each however is altered, extended and diversified. The attempted rescue for instance is mounted by Adriana as by Menaechmus' wife, but her companions are—instead of Senex and the Medicus—a bizarre alliance of Luciana, the Courtesan and "a Schoolmaster, call'd Pinch" (IV.iv.37, S.D.). The frightening of Adriana is less playful than its prototype: whereas Menaechmus the Traveller pretending to be mad is grot-

¹ II.446 and 448, lines 818 and 828 ff., V.ii.

esquely melodramatic, the fury of Antipholus of Ephesus is more truly frightening:

Dissembling harlot, thou art false in all...
 But with these nails I'll pluck out these false eyes
 That would behold me in this shameful sport.
 (IV.iv.98, 101-102)

His binding follows as much because he has really become violent and frenzied as because of a prearranged plan:

Enter three or four, and offer to bind him. He strives.
 (IV.iv.104, S.D.)

In addition he nearly escapes by appealing to the officers who had already come to arrest him for not paying Angelo (IV.i). Shakespeare has commercial as well as family claimants to the Citizen's person, and so creates a three-way conflict for about a dozen people in place of Plautus' two-way conflict for about half a dozen. Just when the scene appears to be over and Antipholus bound, Shakespeare brings on the other twin, with sword drawn. Fear is now mutual, violence still increasing. The effects Shakespeare adds are constantly complication of the intrigue and simultaneously of the serious repercussions of error in terms of feeling.

Shakespeare continues by inserting a series of escapes (which do not however resolve the confusion). After the near-escape of the Citizen and the violent entry of the Traveller (IV.iv), the latter has a second entry, which ends with swords drawn on both sides and his taking refuge in the Priory; and then the Citizen escapes from captivity. Of these only the last resembles

Plautus, in content and positioning:¹ the others may be regarded as a redoubling and intensifying elaboration of the Menaechmi.

Yet perhaps the plainest contrast in theatrical approach between Menaechmi and Errors is to be found in their finales. In Plautus after Messenio rescues the Citizen and before the anagnorisis there is one more mistake-movement: the Citizen gratefully manumits Messenio, but soon the Traveller denies knowledge of both rescue and manumission. As they wrangle the other twin enters, and the three (laboriously) work out the anagnorisis. In Shakespeare however the last complications and the anagnorisis are both longer and more ambitious. Although actual violence subsides once Antipholus and Dromio of Syracuse have escaped into the Priory, and the Abbess and the Duke steady the confusion, they cannot resolve the mutually contradictory complaints. Of these Shakespeare provides a profusion, which recapitulate the errors, intensify them because they now involve all the characters massed on stage, and create suspense as we wait for the few characters who are not on stage to enter and resolve the impasse. But if these additions heighten the intrigue they do not perhaps evoke much sympathy: we are too busy, like Solinus, with the "intricate impeach" (V.i.269). Yet feeling has consistently been Shakespeare's complement to intrigue: so here, at the last possible opportunity, he gives the complaints a graver turn by adapting from the story of Apollonius Egeon's appeal for recognition by his son. His reaction to rebuff by

¹ Shortly before the anagnorisis, exactly as in Menaechmi.

Antipholus of Ephesus is as plangent as anything in the play:

Not know my voice? O time's extremity,
Hast thou so crack'd and splitted my poor tongue
In seven short years that here my only son
Knows not my feeble key of untun'd cares?
(V.i.306-309)

Then at last the Abbess can re-appear, with the refugees, and at once "All gather to see them" (V.i.329, S.D.). At last both twins are on stage together, the best ending to the imbroglio being the simplest: both authors let it speak for itself. Almost everything else in the finale is differently paced. Plautus moves to the twins' meeting more quickly than Shakespeare, but takes the explanation of his single anagnorisis slowly (lines 1062-1132). Shakespeare, having held back the meeting for suspense, handles his greatly increased number of recognitions more briskly. He is as concerned to emphasize present feelings as to explain past errors, and therefore the parents are given prominence: as they have suffered most, the Abbess has earned the right to preside over the moments of family reconciliation. And while Emilia's role derives from the story of Apollonius, Shakespeare heightens its impressiveness since she presides over all the reconciliations, instead of being a participant in only the concluding one. Error as an action and a state of feeling are joined in thought as she summarizes all that has been experienced, and the conclusion is to be, not a rough joke about auctioning the Wife, as in Menaechmi, but the celebration by everybody of the twins' delayed baptismal feast:

Thirty-three years have I but gone in travail
 Of you, my sons; and till this present hour
 My heavy burden ne'er delivered....
 Go to a gossips' feast, and go with me;
 After so long grief, such nativity!
 (V.i.399-401, 404-405)

Through the errors they have found an identity, and this the sanctified feast will ratify.¹

In electing to use Menaechmi therefore Shakespeare was taking advantage of a plot already suited to a dramatist's needs. The action of Menaechmi is confined to one day and one place; it has a beginning, a middle and an end; and its value had already been proved by a long tradition of plays modelled upon it. Stage properties, like the gifts which the Traveller receives in error, stage movements, like the scuffling when the Citizen is taken to be mad, and climactic set-pieces, like the scenes of exclusion and recognition, are already composed into a pattern. So Shakespeare's choice of Menaechmi gives him an original that has done more of his work for him than the originals of The Two Gentlemen have done for that play. On the other hand since Menaechmi is a good deal shorter than the Elizabethan public stage required, his problem is mainly what to add (though some omissions would also be needed). At the level of incident his chief additions are towards greater complication and a more articulated movement of events. It is here, in the technical skill with which the action is made to accelerate and intensify as the anagnorisis draws near, that the play's achievement is most assured.

¹ New Arden CE, V.i.405, n., cf. Introdn., pp.xlv, xlix.

For an understanding of Shakespeare's development as a writer of comedy, however, it is more revealing to consider characterization in Errors. The play surpasses its main source, as in its use of incident, so in its more developed sense of movement; and as events unfold, and reveal unforeseen but convincing consequences, so does the characterization unfold. To achieve this effect Shakespeare has created a pattern of character-relationships around his basic selections, by means of omissions and additions. By considering the pattern, especially the omissions and additions, we can summarize the discussion of Menaechmi and conclude it where it points away from the specific source to wider generic debts.

The characters of Menaechmi are: Peniculus the Parasite, the two Menaechmi, Erotium the Courtesan, her maid, Cylindrus her cook, the Wife, her aged father, the Traveller's slave Messenio and the Doctor. Of these none disappear completely. Angelo and Balthazar derive from the Parasite in that they have to go without a dinner, but they have none of the prototype's cunning, malice or crudely amusing hunger. The function of the Cook is absorbed by Dromio of Ephesus, who invites the wrong twin to dinner; the similar function of the Maid is omitted, but she may be vestigially represented by the maid of Adriana who is this Dromio's wife. The Doctor must have prompted Pinch. The Wife's father, the typically ridiculous Old Man of Intrigue comedy, may have suggested Shakespeare's aged father of the twins, but if so, few characteristics correspond. Indeed the different temper of the two comedies is

well illustrated by these two old men: the one is amusingly decrepit (lines 753 ff), and materialistic (lines 801 ff), the other essentially pathetic, unmoved by material appetite. The Courtesan is equally part of the masculine, unsympathetic world of Roman New Comedy, and her role in Errors is accordingly less important. She has no name, and her entourage, the Cook and the Maid, are transferred along with the dinner to the Wife. Conversely the Wife, who has no name in Menaechmi, receives one in Errors. Messenio the Traveller's clever slave shares some functions with Dromio of Syracuse, but little of character: the Dromios are servants, not slaves, and are not particularly clever. Evidently these omissions and reductions are not unconnected, but rather suggest how Shakespeare is altering the characteristic tone and motivation of Plautine intrigue to something less callous.

Reductions of roles are more than offset by additions and extensions, since Shakespeare has sixteen characters compared with Plautus' ten, and so conforms to his practice in other early comedies. Some additions probably began life as extensions of the source, although their roles are increased: thus Angelo is the goldsmith mentioned during the course of the action (III.iii), while Egeon and Emilia are the parents referred to in Menaechmi (in the preliminary matter and at the anagnorisis respectively) but expanded from the story-tradition of Apollonius. They are supplemented by invented characters, whose main purpose is to increase the absurd complications—the Merchants, the Officers, and above all the Dromios.

It is unnecessary to repeat how they contribute to the confusions, but it may be worth noting that some of them are given more individuality than is needed for such a function. Thus the First Merchant is an earnest well-wisher of the Traveller (I.ii.1-32), the Second Merchant is honourable but fiercer (V.i.24 ff): Dromio of Syracuse is merry by nature (I.ii.19 ff), his twin--perhaps as a result of marriage to Luce--a sad drudge (I.ii.41 ff., II.i. 44 ff., IV.iv.8 ff.). Another added character, Luciana, assists the intrigue and is differentiated from her sister by a gentler, less impatient nature. She serves several other ends too, for as Bullough (I.8-9) says:

the invention of [the Wife's] sister Luciana provides [a confidante], gives a bride for the other brother, supplies feminine contrast, and also makes a part for one of the boys who acted women so well. Moreover Luciana introduces, however faintly, a kind of love and wooing not found in Plautus but already popular in England through the works of John Lyly.

The Abbess, grafted in from the story of Apollonius, is another example of gentler womanhood to contrast with the Wife.

Adriana herself owes more than any character so far discussed to Menaechmi, for she owes her leading trait. In Plautus the Wife has two main characteristics, concern for her property and a tendency to domineer. The first trait is common to most Plautine characters, but Adriana lacks it (II.i.106 ff., IV.ii.63, IV.iv.116 ff.). The second is barely mentioned after the Citizen's first speech, but here, it seems, Shakespeare noticed it:

nam quotiens foras ire volo, me retines, revocas, rogitas,
 quo ego eam, quam rem agam, quid negoti geram,
 quid petam, quid feram, quid foris egerim.
 portitorem domum duxi, ita omnem mihi
 rem necesse eloqui est, quidquid egi atque ago.

(II.374, lines 114-118, I.11)

Why, whenever I want to go out, you catch hold of me,
 call me back, cross-question me as to where I'm going,
 what I'm doing, what business I have in hand, what I'm
 after, what I've got, what I did when I was out. I've
 married a custom-house officer, judging from the way
 everything--all I've done and am doing--must be declared.

(Ibid., II.375)

Possessiveness, a small and isolated trait in the source, is
 heightened and made part of a more complex character: in Adriana
 it is not entirely unattractive because it is an aspect of intense,
 if suffocating, affection (II.ii.172 ff., V.i.98-101). So by
 omitting a trait which the Wife had shared with Erotium and
 expanding another which she had not shared, Shakespeare differ-
 entiates Adriana from the Courtesan. Such changes do not make
Errors a sentimental tragicomedy, of course, because all these
 characters are drawn into the hilarious confusion.

The characters who owe most of all to Plautus are the twins
 themselves. This is no more than we should expect, but it is
 instructive to see what Shakespeare does with them. The main
 alterations are towards a differentiation of the twins, as of other
 pairs, one from another; and towards greater expression of feeling
 in this pair who both occasion errors and suffer from them. In
Menaechmi they are almost as similar in character as in appearance,
 differing in little more than situation and status: both are

unscrupulous, rapacious and lustful in the manner of Roman New Comedy. Plautus does however suggest a few differences, since the Citizen is more boastful yet more easily abashed (IV.ii), while the Traveller is both more feeling (II.i) and more violent (V.ii). Yet the differences amount to little more than differences of situation. Shakespeare is as usual less interested in the comedy of opportunism,¹ but he seizes on minor traits, rearranges them according to his own conception, and expands them. So the Citizen's prosperity and solidity are taken over and extended (V.i.5-8 and 190 ff.). He is less easily browbeaten by his wife, more irascible and above all more violent: he plans swift retaliation for his exclusion (III.i, 107-121) and erupts into fury when his wife sets Dr. Pinch on him (IV.iv.50 ff.). The Traveller, more violent than the Citizen in Menaechmi, is now made less violent than Adriana's husband (although he is more violent than Plautus' Traveller). Instead his foremost quality is imagination and capacity for feeling. The note is struck briefly by Plautus at the first entry of Menaechmus the Traveller (II.i), but Shakespeare strikes it earlier and more firmly (I.ii.20, 33-40).² Moreover he develops the imaginative quality in several directions. The Traveller falls in love with Luciana (II.ii, III.ii) and feels elated by the surprises of Ephesus (II.ii.211-215), yet later, when the

¹ Though his Traveller shows traces of it, his behaviour to Adriana and Angelo is scrupulous.

² Plautus gives both brothers a moment of affection in the finale, but it is trite or cursory, and does not serve to distinguish the two (II.482, lines 1132-4, V.ix). By contrast the two Antipholi have little to say to each other at the close, perhaps because their parents can better express the joy of reconciliation.

surprises become less pleasing, his mind veers to suspicions of diabolical conspiracy (IV.iii.39, 60). So although both twins become violent, the one grows more irate, the other more afraid of nameless harm: one feels that he alone is sane, the other fears that his identity, already uncertain, is being taken from him.¹ The contrary developments, with the transpositions that serve them, are beautifully appropriate; for the twin whose home is Ephesus would naturally be less prone to think himself bewitched than the twin to whom it is an unknown quantity. Moreover the rearrangements--particularly those which bring on the visiting twin first and add the Dromios to increase the possibilities of error--give emphasis to the serious theme underlying the hilarious mistakes, the fear of loss of identity, centred on the twin who comes to Ephesus precisely in order to find an identity in restored family relationship. Ironically the Traveller is made desperate by the very fact--the presence of his lost brother--which should bring him release and fulfilment. The absence of such thematic concerns from *Menaechmi* shows how far Shakespeare has changed Plautus, even with the characters who are most closely modelled on the source.

Two further changes, one negative, one positive, show the same tendency: Negatively Shakespeare's twins are less carefree in morals and manners than the *Menaechmi*. His Citizen is apparently not a habitual libertine, but is provoked into visiting the Courtesan. His Traveller is more decisively contrasted with his original,

¹Cf. New Arden *CE*, pp.xlv-xlvi.

because whereas the original is seen congratulating himself on his easy conquest of Erotium (III.ii), Shakespeare takes care not to imply that Adriana's invitation goes beyond a dinner. Various reasons may be suggested for the elevation of tone. First, Adriana has troubles enough already, and it is stressed that the Traveller is not attracted to her (III.ii.156-157) but to her sister, whom Shakespeare adds primarily for the purpose. Second, Shakespeare may leave vague what happened in the Porpentine because he is not very interested in the Courtesan's role. More generally he seldom allows his comic protagonists to indulge in extramarital intercourse. When a story-source suggests anything of the sort, it is usually altered.¹ This is apparently how he, or his audiences, liked romantic comedy² and the same taste applies to this intrigue comedy as to more purely romantic comedies. It is another indication that Errors is itself partly a romance.

Shakespeare's twins are not simply virtuous by abstention, but are positively made high-minded. Antipholus of Ephesus not only has his credit and financial solidity increased (V.i.5-8), but has done personal service in battle to the Duke (V.i.190-194), and calls him "thee" (ibid.) as no other character does. These points lift him (rather late in the play) on to the plane of romance, but his brother exists much more on that plane. In general this befits his more sensitive nature: in particular it makes him

¹ In MV, MMH and TN particularly.

² A. Harbage, As They Liked It, pp.x-xi et passim.

more scrupulous in not exploiting other people's errors. Above all he woos Luciana with a Petrarchan lyricism:

Sing, siren, for thyself, and I will dote;
Spread o'er the silver waves thy golden hairs,
And as a bed I'll take them, and there lie...
(III.ii.47-49)

It is true that neither twin exists solely in the high atmosphere of romance: there is absurdity too when the Citizen, dishevelled and furious, appeals to heroism, and when the Traveller's strained lyricism causes only embarrassment to the lady (III.ii.53-70). But since romance can accommodate other than serious perspectives on what it takes seriously, it remains true that the twins are a combination of intrigue methods with romantic heightening.

A double purpose is informing Shakespeare's treatment of the twins, for he is simultaneously multiplying the complications they cause (and by the addition of two more twins ensuring that they can themselves make mistakes), and dwelling on their feelings. In other words his extensions of the source develop the intrigue events and a romantic view of them: he outdoes Plautus in both directions.¹ Moreover what is true of the twins is true of the whole play, because though some extensions develop the intrigue more (for instance the Dromios) while others develop the romance more (for instance Egeon, Emilia and Solinus) they also develop romance and intrigue respectively. Just as romance can be so handled as not to preclude intrigue, intrigue has been so handled as to produce manifold extensions into romance. Before we analyse

¹Cf. H.F. Brooks, "Themes and Structure in CE", p.64.

the latter in more detail, let us consider how it is that intrigue, which seems *prima facie* homogeneously unromantic, admits such treatment.

In the first place it is the nature of intrigue to present rapid action accelerating through confusions to final repose. As a result, though the rapidity may hinder attention to emotions, the underlying sense of movement assists it, because character is forced to unfold as it undergoes constantly altering stress and challenge. Shakespeare indeed goes a little way beyond the unfolding of character to suggest, albeit less forcefully than in other comedies, that faulty characters may change, and even learn:

...the main characters are in some sense purged, before harmony and the responsibility of normal relationships are restored at the end. Adriana learns to overcome her jealousy, and accepts the reproof of the Abbess; her husband is punished for his anger and potential brutality by Doctor Pinch's drastic treatment; and Antipholus of Syracuse is cured of his prejudices about Ephesus.¹

The elaborate patterning of relationships in intrigue comedy can also help to reveal character. As a result the structural need of intrigue for forward movement and patterning of character could assist the aims of romance--up to a point at least, to which we must return.

A second reason why Menaechmi could be treated more romantically goes somewhat deeper. The play is in fact less fully an intrigue comedy than others of Plautus, for example Amphitruo,

¹New Arden CE, Introdn., p.1.

because it lacks a central intriguer. No doubt the characters scheme busily against one another, and try to outwit one another (Erotium, Peniculus and Messenio); but none of them controls the outcome, or even succeeds for long in manipulating the others. All are the playthings of error, and of fate which has brought the Traveller to the town.¹ Yet even such scheming as there is in Menaechmi Shakespeare omits or reduces in importance, leaving the way clear for his greater emphasis on error as feeling and the helplessness of the characters before fortune. Fortune, and the gods, would attract his attention in the story of Apollonius too, and are strikingly associated by Egeon with the events that first separate the family (I.i.39, 99, 106, 114, 120-£, 141-£); also with their reunion (V.i.354, 394). And of course the hand of fortune or the divine is a characteristic feature of romances (cf. Cap.2). Shakespeare has therefore selected a source that more than its congeners admits romantic treatment, and has articulated fortune as much as he has imported it.

Romance indeed is to some extent present in all Roman New Comedy, not only in Menaechmi. Love affairs, shipwrecks and unlucky separations have often taken place before the action of these comedies begins; and similarly the anagnorisis usually involves the fortuitous coming together of separated parties, and relies on marks of identification like a casket of jewels or a mole. But what for Plautus

¹G.K. Hunter, John Lyly, p.304. So whereas Messenio presides over the end of Menaechmi the Dromios are unemphasized during the finale until the very last lines.

served only to create the complications which were his main interest and then neatly to unravel them were regarded differently in Shakespeare's time. In general

Men of the Renaissance read Latin comedy in the light of their own predilections, formed to a considerable extent by the tradition that had come down from medieval romances and had branched into the novelle. Consequently, as Madeleine Doran has shown, they gave to the motifs of recognition, shipwreck, long-lost children and the like, when they met them in Terence and Plautus, far more than the value they had originally had there as romance.¹

In particular the "romance" plot of Egeon could be paralleled in the Rudens and Supposes as well as in the tale of Apollonius of Tyre. Given these incentives and precedents therefore it is not surprising that Shakespeare imparts a romantic flavour to Plautine intrigue. Yet when we examine the details of Shakespeare's romanticizing we find that he has exceeded his predecessors considerably in this respect. As H.F. Brooks (pp.64-67) has shown, the four main elements of romance are significantly present in Errors.

Adventure is extended from what is merely a precondition of Plautus' action. The separation of the twins and the Traveller's search are made more prominent. Furthermore they are found in company with a more adventurous birth, involving shipwreck, piracy and fortune as usual in romance; hazards of war; and the long tribulations of quest.

The marvellous is of course present in the extraordinary way, fortuitous yet providential, in which the family is separated and reunited. Not only is the marvellous present in the romantic

¹H.F. Brooks, p.64, cf. M. Doran, Endeavors of Art, p.172.

frame-plot; Antipholus of Syracuse carries the interest in marvel through the main action, because he interprets the errors as a series of adventures with the supernatural, and Shakespeare's location, Ephesus not Epidamnum, assists the emphasis on magical fears. Most remarkable of all perhaps is the finale, for at the very point where the intrigue is reaching its climax and resolution a strong romantic emphasis, on the parents and the wonder of their reunion, is added to the intrigue from the story of Apollonius. It transforms the ending.

Love too is added by Shakespeare to Menaechmi, because he makes Adriana more affectionate than the Wife, and adds her gentler sister, whom the Traveller lyrically woos. The love-theme is amplified further because he deploys it in a variety of forms which comment on one another. Adriana's jealousy is reproved by the Abbess, possessor of true patience since she has waited a generation to meet her husband again; the Citizen on the other hand is not particularly loving or amiable; and the love-declaration of Luce to the wrong Promio and the disparaging blazon he accords her (III.ii.77 ff.), balance and partly ridicule the extremism of the Traveller's wooing of Luciana. But despite his extremism the Traveller points to something of deeper importance to the play's portrayal of love: when he surrenders to his "god" Luciana, who can create him new (III.ii.39), he embodies a new form of love,

because he does not fear but positively welcomes the loss of identity. Beyond their obvious effects of romantic heightening and self-deflating exaggeration, his speeches enlarge the theme of error and anticipate the final glad acceptance of new, as of renewed, relationships.¹ Some errors, it may be, are indicative of an underlying truth which needs to be recognised--an aspect of error which, though it is not developed in Errors, becomes important in such later comedies as A Dream and Twelfth Night. Nevertheless it must be admitted that love has not the prominence it is given in The Two Gentlemen or in later comedies: to this extent Errors is Plautine rather than typically Shakespearean, and stands a little to one side of the development of romance that was traced in the second chapter.

It is *sens par excellence* which Shakespeare has added to the tradition of Menaechmi. The world of Plautine comedy is one of automatic appetition, of type-characters obeying typical appetites. It is a world of surfaces only, where stomachs, bottoms or pockets may incur damage but feelings are not prominent or individual enough to be hurt. Menaechmi is no exception. Errors, as we have seen, frequently penetrates to feelings in the main plot, and feeling is dominant in the frame-plot. The change is particularly marked with the women of Errors and the Old Man, because whereas the women of Menaechmi are aggressive and the Wife's Father a ridiculous dotard these characters become central vehicles of *sens*

¹ A comic exception might be the Dromios' final attitudes toward Luce (V.i.413 ff), and even there the Traveller's Dromio is willing to accept Luce, as his sister. Otherwise we are reminded of MND, in which the four lovers accept whatever it is that has befallen them in the wood (IV.i.184-196), and of Sebastian in TN (see Cap.10 below).

in Errors. Similarly the visiting twin, who is blithely opportunistic during most of the Latin comedy, and expresses feeling only briefly at its beginning and end, is given quite different leading traits: melancholy, which may have been prompted by Menaechmi but also continues the mood already created around Egeon (I.ii.20, 33-40), and a disposition to wonder. Through these characters, as through the first three elements of romance, sens--the treatment of serious themes--is being conducted. The themes include identity and relationship, loss and recovery, death and rebirth, self-delusion and self-discovery. Most of these are implicit in romance, explicit in later Shakespearean comedies, and have perhaps been sufficiently discussed already. We may however conclude discussion of sens and romance in Errors with two matters which need some amplification--wonder, and the relations of comic and serious in the play. The two are closely connected.

A delighted wonder, it was argued, is frequently the response evoked in the characters of dramatized romance, and (by extension) in the audience. Errors is clearly such a play, for it piles wonder on wonder in the finale, the climax being the revelation which surprises even the audience, that the Abbess is the twins' mother. This revelation is however unlike Shakespeare's use of wonder elsewhere: as Bullough says, it "is a touch of supererogation which argues a humorous attitude in the author towards his creation as he piles wonder on wonder" (I.11). Delight and wonder are present in two senses: a serious, involved joy at the

happy outcome, and a comic, detached laughter which includes some disbelief in the improbabilities (of which this last disclosure is the wildest). A similar sly mockery of romance may be found in the fact that the Dromios are identical even to the point of having the same birthmarks (III.ii.137 ff.)—usually an infallible distinguishing mark in romance, upon which great issues are made to depend. Disbelief is not prominent, but it is more prominent than it would be if joyful wonder had been more stressed. Wonder therefore is present under two aspects, involvement and detachment, the former being serious, the latter comic. Romance, it turns out, is once more admitting other perspectives than its own, which because they are kept in balance do not destroy the specifically romantic purposes of the play.

This balance however is the counterpart of what Shakespeare has done with intrigue. The combination of two genres in the play is achieved by treating intrigue seriously as well as comically, and by treating romance comically as well as seriously. The result is a tour de force.

In conclusion however it must be asked how valuable is the fusion of intrigue and farce with romance, if we consider Errors not now on its own terms but in the context of Shakespeare's later comedies. Then the verdict must be that the play has some disadvantages as well as many benefits. The benefits are of course greater. For one thing, though the play is as experimental as

The Two Gentlemen, it is more unified. The intrigue model ensures that the unities of time and place are observed (and yet Shakespeare does not often use them again, any more than he does the wandering romance form of The Two Gentlemen). The momentum of events, the action and reaction of event upon character and of character upon character, remain of permanent use. Another useful element, shared with The Two Gentlemen but more elegantly and sparingly handled, is the quadrilateral of lovers, whose feeling for one another, along with their misunderstandings and reconciliation, carry much of the burden of the play's comic and serious purposes. Yet notwithstanding that the relations of the quadrilateral are well handled, that is partly because the scope of characterization is curtailed by the necessities of intrigue: however much Shakespeare has extended the Plautine types into individuals, the characters are subordinated to the design more than will often be the case. Moreover though the choice of Menaechmi prevents the subjection of character to the schemings of a central intriguer, it hinders character in another way: no intriguer but fate manipulates, but fate equally can take away responsibility. The feeling at the conclusion is that the errors are not very much anybody's fault and can be forgotten, and throughout the play sense takes the form of pathos at some cost to responsibility. Moreover at the lowest level of all the very brevity of Errors, whether or not owed to that of Menaechmi, must have limited the play's scope. So while intrigue contributes to other plays it

is usually less prominent than in Errors. With romance on the other hand the case is otherwise, as we can partly perceive in A Dream, but more clearly recognize in The Merchant and its successors.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE TAMING OF THE SHREW. LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST AND

A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM

Source-criticism of the remaining plays in our earliest group of comedies, and of the first play¹ of the middle group, is hampered by uncertainties concerning the relationships of these plays to their sources. As was pointed out in Chapter One, The Shrew may be progenitor, offspring or sibling to A Shrew, and hence it is impossible to discuss constructively Shakespeare's handling of story-sources and story-traditions in The Shrew. Beyond this difficulty however lie others. In the first place the discussion even of generic debts is bedevilled by the prevailing confusions, because the play's striking combination of three stories of varying genre cannot positively be attributed to Shakespeare, whatever one may wish to think. In the second place no compensating progress can be made for The Shrew with our concept of Shakespeare's own earlier work as a source, since the play belongs to a group whose chronological relations with one another remain largely uncertain. The present discussion cannot therefore derive much of value from dwelling on The Shrew, and will accordingly refer to the play only to illustrate other plays, in their own context.

With Love's Labour's Lost the position is somewhat different, because its source-relationships are a little more

¹ Reasons for thinking MND earlier than MV are summarized in Cap.1.

helpful from our point of view. It is a paradox that they should be so, since they are chiefly remarkable for being so meagre; but at least we can conclude that until more definite source-debts win general credence many elements of the play may be ascribed to Shakespeare's invention. In particular they may be related to the main theme around which so much detail is organized, and to which the unusual absence of a vigorously paced main story gives a clear primacy. First however it is perhaps advisable to delineate a little more fully the nature and the effect of such source-materials as are agreed to underlie the play.

Though no source has been found for the main story of Navarre and his perjury, sources are suggested for a number of smaller-scale features. Rival academies were instituted from time to time in contemporary France by noble enthusiasts for contemplation.¹ Yet contemporary French history has more than only this to offer: a King of Navarre who broke his oath on at least one celebrated occasion; a Queen of France who visited him on a diplomatic mission; her retinue of dazzlingly accomplished ladies; and her elaborate entertainments, including dancing and much promenading in a garden and the adjacent park.² Contemporary sources, but now English ones, have also been suggested for the Muscovite Masque and the sub-plot of Armado, though in neither

¹P. de la Primaudaye, L'Académie française, 1577, trn. by T. Bowes, The French Academy, 1586: see Bullough, I.427-428.

²Bullough, I.428-431.

case with certainty. The Gray's Inn Christmas revels of 1594-5 included a mask of Russians (as well as a performance of The Comedy of Errors), but jokes at the expense of Russian uncouthness perhaps needed no specific source.¹ Similarly in Armado, Moth, Holofernes and the others, we may suspect a good deal of topical reference, and identifications with particular contemporary writers and courtiers are inviting;² yet except that Moth may be based on Thomas Nashe, the identifications have not been completely convincing. It seems that while a humorous satirizing of contemporary manners, especially literary mannerisms, can be recognized and enjoyed, the precise targets--if such there were--have so far usually eluded identification.³ Finally the sub-plot owes a generic debt to the type-characters of continental intrigue comedy: Holofernes for example has points of contact with the Pedant, and Armado with the Braggart.⁴ Yet these parallels too are of only a limited relevance: even the two characters mentioned, in whose case the parallels are clearest, do not owe much to the

¹Bullough, I.432-433.

²F.A. Yates, A Study of LLL, Cambridge, 1936.

³R. David, ed. New Arden LLL, 1951, in the revised edn. of 1956, *Introdn.*, p.xlii, who concludes that exact correspondences may not exist. Yet the more inexact the correspondences, the less value in looking away from the play to actual courtier theoreticians. It is significant too that Bullough avoids discussing the "fascinating 'School of Night' theories of Arthur Acheson, Miss M.C. Bradbrook, and Miss F.A. Yates" in his essay on LLL (I.427). The chief exception which must nevertheless be made to this somewhat sceptical conclusion is that Berowne's mockery of contemporary astronomers (I.i.72-93) may well be aimed at Chapman's School of Night (cf. IV.iii.251).

⁴Some speech-headings, in Quartos and Folios alike, give the sub-plot characters generic names, e.g. Pedant, Braggart, Constable, Clown. Perhaps Shakespeare himself was responsible, cf. New Arden LLL, p.xxii.

characters of intrigue comedy, since Holofernes is so English a figure, while Armado is as much Pedant as Braggart.

Generic debts indeed, although their influence is as impalpable for Love's Labour's Lost as that of the multiple minor story-sources, may be equally important. As well as intrigue elements Lylyan comedy, pastoral and native festive tradition merit consideration. Moreover although the play gives more prominence to death than is usual in Shakespeare's earlier comedies, and proclaims by its very title the defeat of romantic expectation, it nevertheless owes something to the genre of romance. For example two romance motifs are used when the bookmen yield to the importunacy of love (IV.iii), namely the yielding itself (a weightier version of Valentine's surrender in The Two Gentlemen, II.iv); and Berowne's tribute to the power of romantic love learned from women's eyes (IV.iii.292-350). His speech, in fact, though it is delivered tongue-in-cheek and though its function is by quibbling to condone oath-breaking, actually corroborates what it exploits, because the vigour of the verse truly celebrates romantic love.

Generic materials therefore complement the variety of other sources with their own variety. They are however hazardous to discuss where consideration of their use cannot be controlled by reference to specific story-sources, whether or not these are of the same genre. Hence the most striking feature of Love's Labour's Lost, from the point of view of source-criticism, remains its paucity of verifiable sources, and our conclusion should be

that in this play Shakespeare is sufficiently assured as a writer of comedy to do without any main story-source. Instead he gathers extremely varied materials, in large part probably his own invention, into the service of a governing idea, which we may briefly term the triumph of direct experience of life over theorizing disengagement from it. The result is a success, but an unusual one because subsequent comedies seldom if ever give word-play so much scope at the expense of developing action, and seldom too dispense so fully with story-sources. Yet in as far as the play's success is owed to its structure and its treatment of romance, it is not unique in Shakespeare's oeuvre but contributes something to A Midsummer Night's Dream.¹ The latter play also lacks a well-defined main story-source, but a story-tradition and some minor story-sources do exist; and for the first time in our survey there exists also a body of earlier comic work by Shakespeare himself which may be examined as a source of inspiration. I consider first the story-tradition of A Dream.

Shakespeare's play finds its point of departure in the victorious return of Theseus from his war with the Amazons, and its terminal point (towards which the various plots all move) in his wedding to the Amazon queen Hippolyta. In choosing Theseus as his ducal figure and combining other stories with the story of his marriage the dramatist was taking the opportunity to exploit the known attributes of an august personage; but also to select and alter a tradition of stories which gave Theseus additional lustre, although he presides over their events rather than participates in

¹Just as it shares with TS the inclusion alongside romance materials of unromantic and antiromantic elements.

them. It will be convenient to consider Theseus himself first.

Theseus is an attractive figure in classical legend because, like his kinsman Hercules, he was both austere and fallible, a hero with feet of clay. He was famous on the one hand for incorporating the scattered villages of Attica into the single, strong city of Athens, and giving them laws; for offering hospitality to the blinded Oedipus; and for overcoming the Amazons, whose activities were an affront to male superiority, and were usually interpreted allegorically as a revolt of passion against reason. On the other hand he was notorious for his many, and often disreputable, amours: the betrayal of Ariadne, the abduction of the young Helen, and (most brazenly foolhardy of all) the attempt to steal Persephone out of Hades, for which he was imprisoned in the underworld. These are contradictory exploits, the one group suggesting the calm rationality of a sage, the other an impetuous sensuality quite uncontrolled by reason. Shakespeare chose to stress the former group of attributes, but alludes briefly to the hero's less creditable exploits (for example in II.i.77-80); and so the impression given is that though he has been violent in the past he has acquired maturity. Just so his second speech abjures the forcible wooing of his queen in favour of the harmonies of "another key" (I.i.18). As a result he becomes the appropriate foil to the headlong intensities of young love--older and cooler but not unsympathetic. These attributes he shares with Chaucer's Theseus in The Knight's Tale,¹ but Chaucer will be discussed more fully in a moment.

¹Lines 1760 ff., especially 1813 ff. Reference is to The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, ed. W.W. Skeat, 1912.

The victorious return to Athens of Theseus with Hippolyta, the vanquished queen of the Amazons, was made the occasion, at least as early as the Thebaid of Statius (XII.519 ff.), for another exploit: his campaign against Creon of Thebes. Statius closed his poem with Theseus' victory, but Boccaccio in his Teseide seems to have been the first to develop a sequel. Taking less than two out of his twelve books to bring Theseus home with his Amazon, he devotes the remainder to the story of two noble Thebans whom Theseus takes prisoner. This is the story of Palemone and Arcita, which it may be useful to summarize here. In prison in Athens they see Ipolita's sister Emilia and fall in love with her: their bonds of blood and friendship are insufficient to prevent their deadly rivalry in love. After various adventures they fight for her--first in a grove alone, then more chivalrously in a meeting of one hundred knights of either party. Arcita wins; but he is mortally wounded immediately after, and barely outlives his wedding to Emilia. Magnanimous at his death, he resigns her to Palemone, who marries her amid rejoicing.¹

Chaucer preserves Boccaccio's pattern of events, along with much else, though he reduces the length of the story considerably. For our purposes it will be sufficient to note his transmission or introduction² of elements having a bearing on A Dream. The first of these is the fact that the kinsmen see Emelye in the May-time, the season of love (Teseide, III.5-7, Knight's Tale, lines 1034-55);

¹A detailed résumé of the story is given in Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales, ed. W.F. Bryan and G. Dempster, Chicago, 1941, pp.93-105.

²Chaucer's use of Boccaccio is discussed by R.A. Pratt, *ibid.*, pp.87-92, and D. Bethurum, "Shakespeare's Comment on Mediaeval Romance in MND", in MLN, LX, 1945, pp.85-94.

and it is again May-time when Arcite rides out to the grove "to doon his observaunce to May" (line 1500).¹ Both the fights occur in May (ibid. and line 2484). A second element on which Chaucer dwells is the folly of love (lines 1301, 1456, 1578, 1600, 1799-1810, which makes a man "wood".² A third element in the same field of ideas is the presence of the green world—the garden where Emelye is seen gathering flowers; her description in terms of lilies, May, roses, and so on (lines 1035-50); and above all the grove, "swote and grene" (line 2860, cf. lines 1478-81 and 1502-4), where so much of the action takes place. Though Chaucer does not expressly connect the season, the green world and the folly of love, they are clearly inseparables. The similarity of temper between Chaucer's tale and Shakespeare's play is clearer still from the comments of Theseus, who is the same chivalrous, kindly, older man in both works. He shows pity (line 1761) to the two young men who have been caught fighting in his territories, in spite of his orders for their banishment: it is his reason (line 1766) that makes him pity them. He reflects that

'The god of love, al benedicite,
 How mighty and how greet a lord is he!...
 Who may been a fool, but-if he love? ...
 I woot it by my-self ful yore agoon:
 For in my tyme a servant was I oon.'
 (lines 1785-6, 1799, 1813-4)

That Theseus' standpoint is the narrator's is clear when the latter

¹Cf. MND, IV.i.101, where Theseus too has been doing "observation".

²The same pun is found in MND, at II.i.192.

likens Arcite in the grove to "thise loveres in hir queynte geres" (line 1531), "Now up, now down, as boket in a welle" (line 1533).

A sympathetic but ironic perspective on the furious intensities of love is being developed by Chaucer with some consistency. For one thing he lays more stress than Boccaccio on Emelye's indifference to either suitor, by ignoring all the traits of Boccaccio's Emilia except her devotion to Diana and hunting, and positively by giving Theseus a robustly jocular comment on her indifference:

But this is yet the beste game of alle,
That she, for whom they han this jolitee,
Can hem ther-for as muche thank as me;
She woot namore of all this hote fare,
By God, than woot a cokkow or an hare!
(lines 1806-10)

Whereas he is less interested in Emelye he makes the two kinsmen equally important, not following Boccaccio's emphasis on Arcita. The effect of the change is to make it clearer that Arcite, who now sees the lady after Palamoun does, has offended¹ against their agreement not to hinder each other in love (lines 1129-51); but also to suggest that the argument from magnanimity is strained, and that in fact both lovers are rendered foolish by love. Sidgwick² finds a contradiction here, but to me the point of view seems eminently fruitful: in any case it illuminates Shakespeare's, for whom although Demetrius is in the wrong both young men are

¹"Arcite" is a false lover in Chaucer's unfinished poem, Anelida and Arcite, pp.113-118 in Skeat's edn.

²Ed. The Sources and Analogues of MND, p.23.

foolish hotheads. Chaucer depicts the first battle between the two in terms of wild animals:¹ it becomes increasingly furious, and the author increasingly detached, in the key passage,

As wilde bores gonne they to smyte,
That frothen whyte as foom for ire wood.
Up to the ancle foghte they in hir blood.
And in this wyse I lete hem fighting dwelle;
And forth I wol of Theseus yow telle.
(lines 1653-62)

Shakespeare's debt to The Knight's Tale, or some lost derivative of it, has long been recognized at the level of details, which Sidgwick lists (pp.24-25): the names of Philostrate and Egeus, the references to May observances, the hunting activities of Theseus, the setting in Athens and the nearby woods, and perhaps others. Yet such indebtedness is surely less significant than correspondences of general conception, however these were mediated to Shakespeare; in particular the suggestive season and strong (double) setting; and the ironic viewpoint so naturally present since the love story is inserted into a framing story of exploits of the older, more rational Theseus.

The differences are many and for the most part obvious, but at any rate the most salient should be mentioned. Shakespeare's point of view is ironic towards Theseus the ironist too. Broken friendship is stressed in the girls now (III.ii.192 ff.), who are so far from being indifferent to their lovers that they positively cling to them: his purpose appears to be to heighten the pathos and absurdity of the unrequited woman (as in Venus and Adonis), in

¹With the female as prize, presumably. Theseus civilises the encounter in the grove by transferring it to a formal context in the lists.

order to match the more violent absurdity and despair of the men. The comparison with animal behaviour is also transferred to the women (III.ii.260-261, 324). He does not use Arcite's "disguise"--in exile he becomes unrecognizable, to all except Emelye, because his sufferings alter his looks--nor the magnificent medieval trappings of Chaucer's Theseus; nor his Boethian stoicism (lines 1663 ff., 2987 ff.).

After Chaucer at least two versions, both dramatic, seem to have preceded A Dream. The earlier was the Palamon and Arcyte of Richard Edwardes, staged for the Queen in Christ Church Hall in 1566. It is evident from the accounts of eyewitnesses that its intended effect was wonder at the glamour of antiquity, supported by chivalrous magnanimity and enhanced by such spectacular climaxes as the hunting scenes.¹ The text has not survived, and even less is known of the Palamon and Arcette listed by Henslowe for the autumn of 1594; it may have prompted A Dream, and (more conjecturally still) may by a heavyhanded, oldfashioned treatment of romance have suggested to Shakespeare his own more original version of romance.² He returned to the story at the end of his career in his collaborative writing for The Two Noble Kinsmen which shows some points of similarity with A Dream.³ These versions cannot however outweigh Chaucer's tale in importance for A Dream.

¹Cf. F.S. Boas, University Drama in the Tudor Age, Oxford, 1914, pp.102-103, and G.K. Hunter, John Lyly, pp.112-113.

²See Bethurum, "Shakespeare's Comment on Mediaeval Romance in MND", p.91.

³*Ibid.*, pp.92-93.

Besides Theseus and Hippolyta, and the four young lovers, another group of characters can be illuminated by a consideration of their sources, albeit to only a limited extent. The fairies do not stem from any one source or story-tradition--not only because they owe a good deal to popular rather than literary traditions, but because their literary ancestry is itself diverse. In general Shakespeare may have been aware that Chaucer, in The Merchant's Tale, joined fairies with the theme of human marriage, and that in Lyly's Endimion fairies intervene in human relationships. More specifically the naming of Shakespeare's fairies sometimes suggests their provenance: thus "Oberon" derives, directly or by way of Greene's recent James IV, from the romance Huon of Bordeaux, while "Titania" is usually thought to come from Ovid's Metamorphoses, III.173, where Diana is given this title.¹ Yet whereas Shakespeare's Oberon borrows more than his name from Huon, since he is an Eastern fairy and haunts a wood where he performs enchantments (Bullough, I.370-371), Titania owes little more than the name to Ovid.² Aside from the king and queen of the fairies only the Puck, or Robin Goodfellow (II.i.34), owes name or nature to a precedent tradition, most likely to rural folk-beliefs which Shakespeare knew or perhaps to The Discovery of Witchcraft by Reginald Scot (1584). Comparisons of Bottom's "assification" to Apuleius' story of The Golden Ass yield little more than analogues, for although in the inset tale of Cupid and

¹ So Bullough, I.371, and Muir, Shakespeare's Sources, I.31. Yet Ovid gives the title (twice) to Circe (Met. XIV.382 and 438), who seems at least equally suggestive as an original for MND.

² Her character, as an elegant but petty immortal, may owe its general lines to Ovid's anthropomorphic goddesses.

Psyche Venus commands Cupid to make Psyche fall in love with the vilest of men (IV.31, cf. MND II.i.176-182), and although Lucius, after he has been changed into an ass, is promised fine ornaments to wear and dainties to eat by a lovesick lady (VI.28, cf. MND III.i.143-160), these parallels are somewhat remote and in any case isolated. Parallels with the story of Thomas of Erceldoun, who was beloved by a fairy queen, are again remote and are also less specific. Consequently a good many ingredients of A Dream can be ascribed to Shakespeare's own invention, whether that took the form of additions to, or combinations of, the traditional materials. The combinations show an eclecticism which goes beyond the normal Renaissance freedom with mythology for purposes of pageantry, to suggest a comic delight in diversity¹ and to reflect in little the accommodative propensity of the whole comedy. Shakespeare's additions too do not merely enhance the delightful variety of this group of characters but extend his elaboration of the play's themes. Thus not only does he add smaller fairies like Cobweb and Mustardseed, to be played presumably by quite small children, nor only the reference to yet smaller beings who can "creep into acorn cups" (II.i.31): he generates a degree of belief in the whole fairy world by means of a mellifluous poetry, whose prevalent liquids and rhythmic grace² match and indeed embody a world of moonlight, woodland and imagination. By this

¹ Similarly, although the size of the fairies has been keenly debated, for example by M.W. Latham in The Elizabethan Fairies, New York, 1930 and K.M. Briggs in The Anatomy of Puck, 1959, the main point seems to be the diversity of their sizes as of their origins.

² E.g. II.i.60-80, 121-137, II.ii.1-26.

means the fairies, who in their quarrels extend the theme of love beyond the mortal world, extend the related theme of imagination too: Oberon and his moonlit, fancy-dominated kingdom counterbalance Theseus and his daylight, rational kingdom.

The remaining group of characters, the mechanicals, owe something to English stage traditions but most to the dramatist's own imagination and observation, his powers of invention being emphasized here too by the absence of literary sources. Yet the mechanicals' play of Pyramus and Thisbe does stand in some relation to a literary tradition, and that a varied one. Ovid's version of the story in the Metamorphoses (IV.55 ff.), is perhaps the most venerable moulding influence, and we are reminded again at how many points Ovid's reworking of classical myth, and conception of love and metamorphosis as natural companions, have assisted Shakespeare in A Dream.¹ The burlesquing of the tale however may have been prompted by the clumsiness of certain Elizabethan poets. It has been established² that Shakespeare culled several promising infelicities from Golding's translation of the Metamorphoses (1567), including not only particular words but his deafening alliterations and excessive use of the auxiliary "did". Other suggestions include a poem from A Gorgeous Gallery

¹ See M. Doran, "MND: a Metamorphosis", in The Rice Institute Pamphlet, XLVI, 1960, No. 4, pp.113-135, and C.L.Barber, Shakespeare's Festive Comedy, pp.121-123; his chapter on MND is called "May Games and Metamorphoses on a Midsummer Night".

² Muir, Shakespeare's Sources, I.34 ff., and Bullough, I.374-375.

of Gallant Inventions (1578) and one from A Handful of Pleasant Delights (1584), and Thomas Mouffet's splendidly bad poem The Silkworms and their Flies (1599);¹ and the ludicrous verse of some older dramatists may also have stirred Shakespeare's invention.

The mechanicals' play however suggests another kind of indebtedness, to the romance genre which it burlesques as well as to laboured examples of the genre which have been mentioned. Whatever the works were whose romantic excesses prompted Shakespeare to react against them, the essential point is that a reaction occurred and is manifested in the inset play. On the other hand a second essential point is that A Dream as a whole is not really an exposure of romance, as H.B. Charlton and (to a lesser extent) E.C. Pettet² urge. While it is true that the inset play provides a comment on the absurdity of the lovers, perhaps of all lovers, it is also true that the four lovers are not wholly absurd; that they witness the playlet in a spirit of some detachment; and that their capacity for loving, modified as it is by their "dream" experience in the wood, is not disdained but endorsed by the play as a whole.³ When the typical elements of romance, its clichés, are enjoyed for their absurdity, yet in

¹Bullough, I.374-375, Muir, I.33-38 for the first two suggestions; Muir, I.39-45 for Mouffet (discounted, probably on chronological grounds, by Bullough, I.375).

²In Shakespearian Comedy, p.235, and Shakespeare and the Romance Tradition, p.114, respectively.

³Especially in the sympathetic comments of Theseus as they awake (IV.i.174-178) and of Hippolyta at the evening's entertainment (V.i.23-27).

such a way that the fundamental vision and themes of the genre are simultaneously upheld, A Dream is developing that perspective on romance which is initiated in the earlier comedies--uncertainly in The Two Gentlemen of Verona, with greater clarity in the other three. Since however A Dream is the first comedy among whose sources we can legitimately include some of Shakespeare's own comedies, the opportunity will be taken to approach the debt to romance, whether the genre is influencing the play pervasively or specifically, by way of an assessment of the debt to the treatment of romance elements in the preceding comedies.

Three main kinds of indebtedness present themselves--debts of incident, of theme, and of structure¹--of which the first two, being less significant than the third, can be disposed of briefly at once. The elopement of Hermia recalls Silvia's in The Two Gentlemen, and the same play may have prompted some of the attendant circumstances--an irascible father and the removal to a woodland setting, in which further difficulties are faced but are eventually overcome. On the other hand the father's appeal to a harsh law recalls the initial rigour of the Duke in Errors, as well as the stubbornness of Baptista in The Shrew (I.i.48 ff.).

Themes which recur include especially error and the illusions of love--"doting", as it is often called in A Dream. Here a likely

¹Of course the three involve each other: the distinction is somewhat artificial, as are most distinctions within a unified work of art.

source is Errors, for what takes place in the wood near Athens is another comedy of errors. Yet the errors are now less easily explicable, because they are not occasioned by the external accident of twinship, nor are they mistakes of identity but rather of feeling and self-awareness. Some of them, it is true, stem from the application of a magic juice. Yet since we can see from the first scene how flighty and infatuated all the lovers are, even before the juice is applied, it is natural to take the philtre not only literally but symbolically, as an externalization of the proneness to error of dotting sight. External symbol and inward perturbation are combined to make the conception of love's error more penetrating than the simpler conception of error in the earlier play, in which it is significant that error is much less integrally related to the errors of love. Yet A Dream shows not inconsiderable affinities with Errors, some of which could have assisted Shakespeare's ambitious design in the later play, for example the visiting twins' sense of being spell-bound, the Dromios' frequent sense of becoming, or being treated like, asses (II.ii.198, 200; III.i.15, 18, 47 etc.), and the Duke's diagnosis of the whole imbroglio, "I think you all have drunk of Circe's cup" (V.i.270).¹ In the last two examples especially mistakes produce a sense of metamorphosis, which we find extended in A Dream, not only into the lovers' "transfiguration" (V.i.24) but into Bottom's "trans-

¹The myth of Circe, who turned Odysseus' men into swine and back again, is of course exceedingly apposite, and it is significant that she, rather than Diana, may be the source of "Titania" (see above). In either case however the main shaping influence would be that of Ovidian metamorphosis in general.

lation" (III.i.109). But now the images of transformation serve an exploration, not of error at large, but of errors in the imagination, that seedbed of love. The idea is not undermined but satirically counterpointed by Bottom's transformation, since his lack of susceptibility to Titania's blandishments, and inability to be anything but himself despite his outward metamorphosis, defines by contrast the lovers' internal instability despite the continuity of their outward appearance. In such ways as these, then, A Dream integrates the theme of love's illusions with the theme of error, continuing but expanding material from Errors. Moreover these illusions are not altogether faulty, insofar as they partake of imagination. Here The Shrew may have helped to advance Shakespeare's thinking, because in that play Christopher Sly, deluded into supposing himself a lord, nevertheless responds by exercise of imagination to his new status; and this movement is extended in the play, proper as Katherina gradually becomes the tender, gracious wife Petruchio from the outset assumes her to be, Finally from Love's Labour's Lost may have come a suggestion that, though to love is better than not to love, love must be disciplined by other kinds of moral experience. If so however the nature of such experience has changed, from the rather deliberate and external penances imposed upon Navarre and the others to a purgation that appears to be an integral part of the illusions of love. Love now is both illusion and imagination, the two states being hardly separable: no such clear-cut distinction of faulty and virtuous

loving is made as in The Two Gentlemen and Love's Labour's Lost. In all these ways, as well as others, A Dream uses but redeploys themes from earlier comedies.

Structurally too A Dream seems to profit from its predecessors, and in two ways especially: in its manipulation of a quadrilateral of lovers, and more generally in its comparisons and interactions between groups of characters. The Two Gentlemen had a good deal to offer: not only the four lovers themselves, but several details of their situations and interactions. Thus both plays contrast constant woman with less constant man: indeed even the differentiation within the pairs shows correspondence, since Demetrius, like Proteus, twice changes heart in earnest while Lysander, like Valentine, changes more superficially, and both pairs of ladies include a woman who forlornly follows a fickle lover when he pursues the other woman. On the other hand A Dream rearranges some details of the entanglement so that for instance the breaking of a friendship by the pressures of love is transferred from the men to the women, and the total number of changes of heart is increased from two to four. The effect of both these rearrangements is to produce a humorous detachment, which also distinguishes A Dream from its rather humourless predecessor, and suggests in fact that it owes a good deal to Errors.

As in Errors the four characters of the quadrilateral are passive victims of manipulation rather than free, responsible agents

(though in A Dream the manipulators are fairies, not fortune, and since they are seen on stage they come under our judgment, which is partly an adverse judgment). Both plays include men who pursue ladies with conventional protestations of undying love; ladies who cling to each other for support; and a lady who combines absurdity and pathos as she pursues her man through a variety of difficulties (like Venus in the verse romance). In general too a whirl of erroneous loving and mistaken self-identity¹ generates a bustling action which is comic but also serious.

The Shrew and Love's Labour's Lost do not contribute to the development of the quadrilateral. In the one play, though it has a quadrilateral and rivalry between its members, there is no interchange or misunderstanding, while in the other there are not two but four pairs of lovers, whose relations involve neither interchange nor rivalry.² The debt of A Dream to these plays centres rather on their wider groupings of characters. The Shrew may contribute its joining of disparate social worlds, the rural world of Sly and the aristocratic world of the frolicsome lord who meets him, and the Italian world, part courtly part mercantile-bourgeois, of the Shrew story; but the effect of these juxtapositions is a little tentative, not only because Sly soon fades out of the text as we have it, but because so much of the play keeps within fabliau and intrigue patterns. For a much fuller structural parallel, which surely amounts to a debt, we must turn to Love's Labour's Lost.

¹Just as Antipholus of Syracuse seeks an identity in seeking his twin (I.ii.33 ff) and in wooing Luciana (III.ii.34 ff), so the lovers of A Dream find an identity in their eventual love-recognitions (IV.i.184-196).

²Except momentarily during the masque, V.ii.158-264.

With the latter play A Dream shares both a movement of events and significant, almost emblematic juxtaposing. The movement in question is from initial folly to greater folly, to clarification, to a release which involves a celebration of human and seasonal rhythms, the final effect involving in both plays an adroit combination of pastoral, festive and romance traditions. In the course of this movement a courtly group of lovers are revealed as hardly wiser than a group of clownish fools, yet when the latter put on a display for a ruler's pleasure (by their own initiative) the courtiers sedulously mock their efforts. The fools are not abashed or silenced, but persevere, to earn due approbation. As a result folly is not so much purged by ridicule as tolerated in a sense that, as G.K. Hunter says of Much Ado, "we are all, somewhere, 'writ down an ass'".¹ A corollary is that it is not wise to isolate oneself, even from a society of fools, and this may explain why both plays include scenes in which characters from opposite social worlds are brought together, not only with dignity, but mutual respect and enjoyment. As Costard and Berowne, Armado and Jaquenetta meet, so do Bottom and Theseus (V.i.341-351). Perhaps the climactic meeting of opposites is that of Titania and Bottom, who are distant from one another not only socially but metaphysically--as distant indeed as could well be imagined. Shakespeare perhaps discovered in Love's Labour's Lost the delight and significance for comedy of selected suspensions of decorum, and worked the vein further in A Dream, (and further again in As You Like It). At all

¹G.K. Hunter, William Shakespeare: the Later Comedies, 1962, p.32.

events it is clear that Love's Labour's Lost shares with A Dream not only structural features but a way of patterning character, and even a sense of the import of the comic action.

A web of ingeniously and profoundly connected meaning is fashioned by Shakespeare from all these kinds of source--story-sources and story-traditions, genres and his own earlier works. Yet the multiplicity of likely sources should not lead us to think we have accounted for much of the play: we cannot say which story, or which group of characters, first came into his mind, nor can we see which of them suggested his themes--it is equally probable that the idea came first, even if it does not have the same primacy as idea in Love's Labour's Lost. Nevertheless what is probably Shakespeare's next comedy represents a kind of reversion to the procedure of Errors, at least as far as source-relationships are concerned; for in The Merchant we find once more a main story-source which is of great importance for plot, character and themes alike.

CHAPTER SIX

THE MERCHANT OF VENICE: ETHICAL ROMANCE

The Merchant¹ contains graver moments than anything in A Dream, to such an extent that it is sometimes considered a tragic-comedy. Though death and isolation from community are real possibilities in its world, I am not convinced that their shadow is potent enough to make the play a tragicomedy; but since one is certainly more aware of moral debate than in previous plays it seems most appropriate to consider The Merchant as an ethical comedy. The methods by which the ethical concern is developed are not unlike the organizing methods of A Dream in that we once more find an elaborate combination of story-sources and traditions, and also a certain debt to romance, especially in regard to sens. The

¹ Sources of The Merchant are referred to in the following texts: Bullough, I.463-476 for Il Pecorone by Ser Giovanni Fiorentino (1558), Day 4 Story 1 (Bullough's own trn.); for the Italian text the version is that printed in Shakespeare's Library, ed. W.C. Hazlitt, 6 vols., 1875, I.319-353; Bullough, I.476-482 for extracts from The Three Ladies of London by R.W. (1584); Bullough, I.497-505 for Il Novellino by Masuccio Salernitano, (1476), Story 14 (trn. in 2 vols. by W.G. Waters, 1895); Bullough, I.511-514 for the story "Anselmus the Emperour" from the Gesta Romanorum, Story LXVI in MS Harl.7333 (one of several Early English versions). A version more relevant to our play is the version of R. Robinson (1595), parts of which are printed by J.R. Brown in the New Arden MV, pp.172-174. Brown prints also the ballad of Gernutus, pp.153-156. His extracts from Zelauto or The Fountain of Fame by Anthony Munday (1580), on pp.156-168, are fuller than those of Bullough, I.486-490. I have used Brown's printing of Declaration 95 from The Orator by Alexander Sylvain, Englished by L.P. (1596), pp.168-172, as being slightly more informative than Bullough's printing, I.482-486. The Jew of Malta by Christopher Marlowe is referred to in the edition of H.S. Bennett, 1931; his line-numbering, by act, scene, and line within the scene, is followed in preference to other systems. The Jew referred to by Gosson is discounted in the present discussion, for reasons given in Cap.1 above.

sources and traditions are however easier to discern and more fruitful to study than those of A Dream and are accordingly discussed first.

Shakespeare combines at least six kinds of tale, each with a long pedigree: the Flesh-Bond, the Choice of Caskets, the Rings, the Usurer Overreaching, the Villainous Jew and the Elopement of a Jew's Daughter with a Christian. Though other authors combined some of these elements, none combined so much so homogeneously. As a tour de force of combination the play has never failed to delight by its variety, and in this respect it not only builds on the achievement of A Dream, but looks ahead to the achievement of Twelfth Night.

Any survey of the story-tradition must begin with the Bond of Flesh. It has been much debated whether the story originated in an oriental legend, an old German legend or in the practice of primitive law;¹ but perhaps the debate has been misconceived, since the most potent myths often occur in societies so widely separated that oral diffusion seems less likely than independent creation. It will be more useful to look at the Bond of Flesh story, which emerges in written form in the European Middle Ages, against a larger mythic background, in order to discern its abiding interest. Its affinities are in fact both wide and powerful, whether in myth or in the philosophy of law.

¹ Discussion in, for example, Bullough, I.446-447; H. Sinsheimer, Shylock. The History of a Character, 1947, Cap.4; J.L. Cardozo, The Contemporary Jew in the Elizabethan Drama, Paris, 1925, Cap.7.

The parallel with oriental tales does not go beyond the giving of a pound of flesh. Thus in the Mahabharata a king saves a dove from a hawk by giving up the dove's weight of his own flesh; in another Indian story a camel offers a jackal a pound of its flesh, but the jackal demands the tongue instead; and in the Talmud Moses offers his breast to an eagle which has stolen a lamb.¹ The essential theme of these stories is the generous sacrifice of a noble spirit, on behalf of a creature in need, to a fiercer adversary. Antonio speaks of himself as a sacrifice, "a tainted wether of the flock,/Meetest for death" (IV.i.114-115). Since Portia (III.ii.57) and Bassanio (IV.i.277-282) also speak of sacrifice, Shakespeare may have seen that sacrifice is an element common to the wooing story and the Bond story, and used it to help him blend these different parts of his play.

What is a sacrifice against this background of legend becomes against the background of early law a forfeit.² By the Twelve Tables of Roman law (fifth century B.C.) creditors could claim the body of a debtor and divide it among themselves (Sinsheimer, pp.80-82). The parallel is not close with Shylock's claim but three implications may be more relevant. Firstly Antonio's bond involves a forfeit, or punitive sanction, rather than the normal payment of interest and legal protection for the lender. Secondly since according to tradition the Roman penalty was so deterrent that nobody fell

¹ Bullough, I.446-447, Sinsheimer, pp.71-72.

² The word is used eleven times in the play, and "forfeiture" eight times.

foul of it, Antonio is particularly unlucky, and Shylock unusually rigorous, in applying the letter of this law in a "losing suit". Thirdly the nature of the forfeit makes the borrower liable to lose everything: then if he borrows for another person how noble is his risk. This implication too cannot have been lost on Shakespeare, even though Antonio does not see his uncertainty as a risk (I.iii.151 ff.).

More generally the Bond story relates to stories of imprudent oath or bargain, in which a man agrees to terms which he is sure he will never need to fulfil, or does not foresee how the terms may fall out in the event. Such stories can be tragic, as in the case of Jephthah, who vowed to sacrifice "whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon" (Judges XI.31). More often the fulfilment of the oath is averted by some god who is actually displeased by such ruthless piety; so it is with Idomeneus, or Maeander, or Abraham and Isaac.¹ In this context Antonio never expects that he will incur the forfeit (I.iii. 175-176). As for Shylock, he rather than Antonio makes a vow, to force himself to carry out the bloody bargain; yet circumstances prevent him. The prevention is not without suggestion of divine approval, and the supersession of a less adequate religious outlook by a more charitable one.

Another aspect of the archetypal situation is more comic, ironic, dramatic. The proponent of a cruel bargain, who rigorously insists on due fulfilment according to literal justice rather than

¹References are to Robert Graves, The Greek Myths, 2 vols., 1955, II.350 and 352-353, and to Genesis, XXII. The Bible is referred to, and quoted, in the Authorized Version.

natural equity, is finally cheated of his prey. Not merely does he not get his bargain but when he wants the principal in lieu he gets nothing at all. The overreacher relents too late and everyone enjoys his discomfiture. It goes without saying that these versions lend themselves to dramatization more than versions where the vow is carried out, which are likely to be repugnant rather than tragic, or versions where the vow is overruled by the intervention of a god, which tend to be melodramatic. The comic versions have an inherent double ironic movement that is satisfying, whether it is clothed in folk-tale, novella, ballad or dramatic form. On the one hand the bond is made imprudently, and there is a certain justice of cause and effect when events conspire to make the borrower stand to his unwise vow. On the other hand the appalling consequences are averted, and the vengeful literalist is stopped on the brink of action.

Against such a background of significance we may now consider some specific contributions to the Bond-story tradition. Extant written or printed versions begin with a thirteenth-century Old French version of the Dolopathos. Others are found in the Cursor Mundi, a long poem in English of the late thirteenth century;¹ the Gesta Romanorum;² Il Pecorone; the ballad of Gernutus; Sylvain's Orator (1581); and Munday's Zelauto. Two variables in

¹Toulmin Smith, "On the Bond-Story in MV, and a Version of it in the Cursor Mundi", The New Shakespeare Society's Transactions, I.3-4, 1875-6, pp.181-189.

²Story XL in S.J.H. Herbage, The Early English Versions of the Gesta Romanorum, E.E.T.S., Extra Series No. 33, 1879, pp.158-165.

these stories are of particular importance. One concerns the motives of the man who agrees to forfeit his flesh, the other the personality of the man to whom the forfeit is due. (For convenience the two men will be designated the Donor and the Bond-holder).

The motive of the Donor is usually love: money is needed to finance a courtship. Either he must raise money for the journey to woo his lady or he must have money for her as precondition of some additional wooing-test.¹ Of these the first is the simpler motive, and it is Antonio's (except of course that it is not his own courtship which he is financing). The second, which Shakespeare did not use directly, is found in the Dolopathos, the Gesta Romanorum and Pecorone versions, where the money is needed as entrance-fee² to a wooing-test: if any man who has paid the stipulated sum can consummate union with the desired lady she is bound to marry him. It is usually left obscure whether the lady sets the conditions or is herself subjected to the custom of the country, but at all events she is eager to have the money. She is clever in preserving her chastity, by means of a soporific--a magical feather in the Dolopathos, a magical letter in the Gesta,³ drugged wine in Pecorone. Shakespeare presumably disliked the rapacity and deceit of these ladies, and had no use for bedroom escapades. Portia's magic is of a different sort, although it is interesting that the play alludes

¹The variations are conveniently tabulated in Cardozo, pp.254-264. Hereafter the woman who is wooed with the help of the borrowed money will be termed the Lady.

²In Pecorone Giannetto is not required to pay a specific sum, but must have ships and cargo to forfeit--which comes to the same thing.

³See the old Arden edn. of MV by C. Knox Pooler, (5th edn., 1927), pp.xxxi-ii.

to Medea (V.1.13). More important is his adaptation of the Lady's predicament, unfree to choose a husband but partly able to reject the unwary and unworthy. Most important of all, Shakespeare sees that the wooing-test is a bargain, or bond, between the suitors and the Lady--a counterpart in fact to the Flesh-bond. So he simply substitutes a nobler form of wooing-test.

Whereas the motive is consistently love the tradition divides into two branches concerning the Donor's identity. Pecorone is the first to separate the Donor from the lover. The effect is naturally to heighten the nobility of the Donor, who is risking his life for someone else, who may be termed the Beneficiary. But now the latter is in danger of seeming heartless, or at any rate oblivious, in allowing such a peril to be undergone for him. In the upshot too he seems dangerously helpless, because it is always the Lady in disguise who extricates the Donor from his peril. So in Pecorone Ansaldo's character is noble like Antonio's, but Giannetto's is sadly tarnished. Shakespeare might have followed the other branch of the tradition, in which the lover himself is the Donor, and of which Munday's story in Zelauto is a late example. He elected however to retain Ser Giovanni's innovation; but he made sure that Bassanio's character did not suffer moral eclipse, building him up wherever he could, and stressing that he too undergoes risk for the sake of love.

The other main division in the tradition concerns the Bondholder. In the earliest versions he is a former serf of the Donor,

who had cut off the serf's foot in a fit of anger. The first known version to make the lender a Jew is the Cursor Mundi, dating from the very period in which Jews were expelled from England. It is interesting that the earlier villain was also a social underdog with a legitimate grievance, and that since the master had cut off his foot a pound of flesh would be an especially apposite retaliation. But once the Bond-holder becomes a Jew the relief at his discomfiture becomes also the triumph of one religion over another. Shakespeare takes his opportunity to contrast an ethic of mercy based on a religious foundation and an ethic of strict justice that is partly religious, although as we shall see Shylock is not the stereotyped evil Jew of medieval legend, nor necessarily a typical Jew.

The quality of most contributions to the Bond story-tradition is high, no doubt because the inherent situation is strong. As a result the tradition continues after Shakespeare's time, with variations old and new.¹ One startling version of his own day, The Three Ladies of London, translates the Jewish money-lender into the hero, the villain of the piece now being an Italian renegade. It operates nevertheless with a moral contrast similar to that of most versions, including The Merchant, namely the contrast of unselfish sacrifice and heartless self-assertion. But not only does Shakespeare define this polarity more clearly: he adds two

¹ See e.g. M. Schlauch, "The Pound of Flesh Story in the North", JEGP, XXX, 1931, pp.348-360.

subsidiary stories which reinforce its meaning, the Choice of Caskets, and the Jew's Daughter. The one story always contrasts right and wrong reasons for choice; and in the other the girl always runs from a cold father to a warm lover. In our brief survey of these subsidiary traditions we shall begin with the Caskets because they are more important to the main, Bond, plot.

The Caskets situation is again widespread.¹ Its essence is constant: given the opportunity to choose among two or more caskets, whose contents are unseen but known to be opposite, how is one to choose? The meaning of the tales is that as a man is, so he chooses: the virtuous man chooses best. On the other hand, the conditions of choice, and the meaning given to "the best" choice, vary. Sometimes the caskets look exactly the same, in which case the chooser can only trust to his luck or to divine assistance. Boccaccio's tale of Ruggieri is shaped to prove that Fortune is his enemy,² and in Gower the point is that God rewards the good by means of such lotteries.³ Coming nearer to the caskets of Belmont we find many other versions of the situation where the caskets do not look identical. Though the essence is still choice, it is not destiny but the chooser's own qualities by which he will fail or

¹ See Stith Thompson, L.211 ("Modest choice: three caskets type").

² Decameron X.1, cf. Bullough, I.458-459, and Dunlop, I.75 n.2.

³ Confessio Amantis, V.2238-2441, reprinted by Bullough, I.506-511. Decameron I.3 is different again. Its three rings look identical, but only God, at the end of time, can say which has the exceptional virtue. It is interesting that this moral applies to a comparison of religions, Jewish, Moslem and Christian.

succeed. In more primitive examples the quality tested is simply cleverness, as in the myth of Zeus and Prometheus. When Zeus had to choose which portions of a sacrificed bull should be offered by men to the gods, Prometheus as arbitrator showed him two open-mouthed bags, one containing flesh hidden by the stomach, the other containing bones hidden by the rich fat. Zeus chose the latter because of its appearance and received the reward of his superficiality.¹

Though superficiality remains the quality exposed by the caskets of Shakespeare and his source, the Gesta Romanorum, it has become more moral than intellectual. In both versions there are three caskets, and both acts of choice concern marriage. In the Gesta, if the princess chooses correctly she will wed the emperor's son. She passes over a golden casket, inscribed "Who so chooseth mee shall finde that he deserueth", and a silver one, inscribed "Who so chooseth me shall finde that his nature desireth", and selects the leaden one, inscribed "Who so chooseth mee, shall finde that God hath disposed for him". Her reasoning is that gold surfaces may mislead; what her nature desires is "the lust of the flesh"; but "without doubt God neuer disposed any harme." The concluding "Morall" interprets the choice as one between life and death. The gold surface covers dead bones, like "worldly men"; the silver also covers bones, for that means hell and superficial choice deserves hell; the third choice is that of the simple life and Christian

¹Graves, The Greek Myths, I.144.

humility.¹ It is quite an effective fable, but suffers from clumsiness in the detail and unsubtlety in the meaning.

Shakespeare's rehandling is decisive and most instructive. He keeps the three caskets, each inscribed, and also the bond or bargain that correct choice will secure marriage. His language echoes the tale at several points.² Almost everything else is omission, alteration or addition. First of all he multiplies suitors, thereby enhancing the value of Portia and Bassanio alike. Most of these suitors are too fainthearted even to risk choosing, in face of the forfeit which has been added to the bond (II.i.38-42). The two who do attempt choice before Bassanio are misled by appearances, for both are too proud and sure of their merit: Morocco chooses gold, but finds gilded death, reward of the proud, and Arragon, trusting to "desert" (II.ix.51), chooses silver. The latter's reward is a fool's head, because to trust in merit is, for a Christian, to invite disaster. Shakespeare changes the contents of the silver casket and its implication, perhaps because the repetition in his source seemed lame. As for the leaden casket, inscription, contents and meaning are all changed. The inscription is made harder to recognize as the clue it is, except to an unselfish lover. The contents are changed from jewels to the lady's portrait, which allows Bassanio to speak in immediate praise of his lady's beauty (III.ii.

¹Quotations here are from the New Arden MV reprint of Robinson's 1595 trn. of the Gesta, pp.172-174.

²Besides "insculp'd", II.vii.57, from the tale proper, p.173, we find "tombs" and "worms", II.vii.69, from the "Morall", p.174. "Posy" (p.173, V.i.148, 151) also recurs, but transposed from the Caskets to the Rings.

114 ff). As for the meaning, Shakespeare expands upon it by means of the lovely song and the climactic speech in which Bassanio reasons out his choice. By disowning merit Bassanio proves he has it. He sees that fine appearances may belie reality: "So may the outward shows be least themselves" (III.ii.73) and death, not joy, be the consequence (lines 96-98). Having avoided gold he is in little danger from the silver. It is peremptorily dismissed as a financier's drudge, irrelevant to love, (his very brevity speaking volumes). As for lead its virtue is that since it does not flatter as gold and silver may it is more to be trusted. This fact, with the inscription Shakespeare gives to the lead, "Who chooseth me must give and hazard all he hath", crowns the little fable, so that self-giving is the instrument, guide and reward of choice.

Just as the Caskets story is made into a little series of scenes (I.ii; II.i, vii, ix; III.ii) so is the story of the Jew's Daughter (II.iii, iv, v, vi, viii; III.i, ii, iv, v; V.i). Slight as they are Jessica's adventures contribute to the emotional polarity of the play. Whether we look at the medieval tales discussed by B.D. Brown,¹ or at Masuccio's version in Il Novellino, at Munday's Zelauto, or at Shakespeare's own Shrew² and Dream, the emotional essence is the same. A young, passionate girl has a like-spirited lover, with whom she escapes, literally or figuratively, into

¹"Medieval Prototypes of Lorenzo and Jessica", in MLN, XLIV, 1929, pp.227-232.

²Zelauto may have influenced The Shrew: there are verbal parallels, discussed by Bullough, I.453-454.

marriage from an unsympathetic father. It is always obvious that the audience's sympathy is to be given to the young against the old, to reckless love against calculating caution, to warm vitality against killjoy gloom. This of course is in the mainstream of romance and of festive comedy, and The Merchant reveals this allegiance most clearly when the lovers elope under the cover of a masked revel--just because their disguises are not rationally needed. Whereas the earlier tales give only a few reasons to assist our instinct to identify with young lovers, Shakespeare apparently includes as many as he can, consistently with the minor place which Jessica's story is to have in the whole play.

Perhaps however the effect of this sub-plot on the characterization of Shylock is equally important. In this type of tale the father is always a curmudgeon, and in the sub-type to which Jessica's tale belongs he is usually a miser, as is, for instance, Masuccio's dreary old skinflint (Bullough, I.498-499); or a usurer, as in Zelauto; if not both. In these versions the father is not a Jew. In the medieval versions where he is a Jew he is sometimes a miser, but not a usurer. Munday's version is the only one in which the miser holds a Flesh-bond. Shakespeare however combines all these traits in Shylock, with the effect and surely the purpose of rendering him morally repugnant. Predecessors like Masuccio or Munday seize on the irony that because the father is so mean and greedy he can be outwitted precisely by appeals to his greed. Shakespeare

does not use the idea directly, but may have been prompted by them to make Shylock unwisely go to dine with the Venetians out of hate (II.v.14-15), leaving Jessica alone in his house: though his defect is hate rather than greed it is equally his undoing. Shakespeare more clearly diverges from the tradition at the end, because in most versions the father is eventually reconciled with his daughter and son-in-law, and with their Christian profession if he has been a Jew, whereas although Shylock is compelled to adopt Christian faith, of reconciliation with his expanded family there is no trace. The character of Shylock therefore stands in a threefold relation to this story-tradition. Shakespeare sees the unattractiveness of the girl's father and increases it. He appreciates the irony that the father is bamboozled by means of his faults; this poetic justice in the sub-plot prefigures what is to happen in the Bond-plot. Finally Shylock is left unreconciled, more isolated and more disturbing than his prototypes,¹

Another more general aspect of the Jessica sub-plot is shared with the medieval predecessors in which the father is a Jew. His Jewish faith is strongly contrasted with the more efficacious Christianity of the daughter's lover. The latter's behaviour is often morally dubious or downright scandalous;² and a little of this dubiety would apply, rationally, to Lorenzo's careless taking and spending. The contrast of faiths in this sub-plot however is

¹Marlowe's Barabas comes closest in this respect. On the other hand his story is not romantic or festive, nor does Abigail's story run parallel with Jessica's.

²B.D. Brown, pp.230-232.

not so much ethical, still less theological, but emotional: Lorenzo's gaiety makes him in comedy more admirable than Shylock, (though his heartlessness also gains the Jew some sympathy—one aim in Shakespeare need not exclude its opposite).¹ Because full confrontation, in terms of belief and ethics, between the two faiths is reserved for the main plot, the sub-plot serves chiefly to emphasize the Christians' greater joy and vitality, in strong contrast with the cold joylessness of the rigid Orthodox.²

Lock up my doors, and when you hear the drum,
And the vile squealing of the wry-neck'd fife,
Clamber not you up to the casements then,
Nor thrust your head into the public street
To gaze on Christian fools with varnish'd faces;
But stop my house's ears—I mean my casements;
Let not the sound of shallow fopp'ry enter
My sober house. (II.v.28-35)

As for the interweaving of the Jessica plot into the play, Bullough's comment (I.457) is so pertinent that it should be quoted in full:

Broached suddenly in medias res so that we know Jessica is about to elope before we see how tyrannical (like Masuccio's miser) Shylock is towards her, the little subplot serves to keep the erotic action moving and, being interpolated between the arrival of Morocco and his Casket-scene, it keeps up suspense and gives the contrast of a different kind of lovemaking....We do not lose sight of the couple afterwards...Rarely did Shakespeare use so effectively figures with so little part in the main story.

The integration of the three story-traditions is very skillful. All are kept moving at once, and through juxtaposition define each other, by similarity and contrast. Yet even this is not the full extent of Shakespeare's materials and his combining of them.

¹ A similar balance obtains in the case of Malvolio.

² He addresses his daughter here by the distant "you" form.

Besides Il Pecorone, his main story-source, some consideration must be given to literary traditions of the villainous Jew, popular beliefs about Jews, orthodox Jewish traditions, and the English Bible. These are not so much sources of story as of characterization, but not the less important for that. They are particularly worth considering alongside Pecorone because in that work characterization is somewhat sparse: here too Shakespeare laid his hand on the best sources to supplement what his main source afforded him. It will be most convenient to examine Pecorone first by itself; then to discuss how Shakespeare uses it; and finally to consider how he supplements its characterization from other sources.

Because the tale in Il Pecorone gives enough attention to motivation and character to be convincing but not so much as to slow or blur the narrative shape, it gives Shakespeare a flying start. But though we shall see in a moment how he used these qualities of the tale, it contains at least two other strains.

One may be called pageantry. Giannetto's ship flies his personal flag and rides in the harbour under the Lady's castle while onlookers scurry about on the quayside (Bullough, I.469-470). On each visit there is dancing, singing and feasting at the court (465, 468, 470 and 471), and on the final visit there is jousting as well (470). The courtly lavishness of both the parties has a bright but two-dimensional quality that is like a medieval illumina-

ted manuscript or a renaissance tapestry. Shakespeare could not well aim for the same effect; but insofar as pageantry is festive he makes full use of this element in the novella. Bassanio like Giannetto is manly and a courtier, and is constantly escorted by admiring friends and liveried servants. All such festivity is congenial to comedy and strengthens the polar opposition of the Venetians to the Jew.

The other strain is the fairytale or magical. *Prima facie* it ought not to belong with the predominantly realistic strain, yet it does, and at times contributes a peculiar, rather sinister resonance. The first fairytale element is Giannetto's birth--the youngest of three sons, he must leave home and to some extent make his own way; and it is equally characteristic of fairytale and folklore that his wooing-journeys are three in number. The Lady lives in a marvellous castle, called by the symbolic, non-geographical name "Belmont". It is in keeping that she is not named, though she is so important in the denouement, because if she were not the hero's prize more than an individual, her motives might seem queer indeed, if not repellent. She is glad to welcome her suitors, embracing and feasting them courteously, but her warmth is apparently in anticipation of spoils (470); and when Giannetto succeeds in the wooing-test she is equally delighted--surely a curious reaction. My tentative explanation would be to relate her behaviour to traditions of folklore. Although the soporific which this Lady employs is less manifestly magical than

the ones which her predecessors in the Dolopathos and Gesta used, something like magic or a spell controls her actions: she is as much bound by the custom as her suitors are. She must resist as hard as she can, yet will be glad when the spell is broken. Such an explanation can only be speculation, since the magical elements are so muted; nevertheless there is something in the novella that requires explanation, because although it has a simple Boccacesque motivation on the whole, it is related to an ancient story-tradition where magic appears in versions almost contemporary with Ser Giovanni. Shakespeare for his part omits most of the fairytale and magic. Bassanio's family is not discussed and he makes only one wooing-journey. The symbolic, unlocalized name "Belmont" is retained but the mysterious aspects of the Lady's behaviour are replaced by the romantic marvellous (to be discussed further below), which surrounds Bassanio's quest, Portia herself and her inscrutable father's test.

As for the realistic larger part of the story and the question how Shakespeare uses its treatment of incident, its language and its motivation, since the story of Giannetto is longer and more circumstantial than earlier Bond-stories, we might expect the dramatist to use it for all these aspects, (though not all equally and not all the time). To begin with the primal debt, that of incident or story-line, he uses the novella a good deal, but intermittently. He begins his play at a later point in the story, probably for reasons of dramatic economy, and having brought his young suitor

to Belmont he diverges again, substituting for the bedroom struggles of the novella the more dignified Caskets-test. Thereafter however he follows his source very closely. Elements common to both works include the following. After the lover has exchanged pledges with the Lady he suddenly has to return to Venice, to the Donor of the Flesh-bond. He sets off, equipped with his wife's encouragement and many more ducats than the sum owed to the Jew (Bullough, I.471, cf. III.ii.308-309). His wife follows, unbeknown to him, in male disguise as a lawyer (472, cf. IV.i.162, S.D.). Her husband offers the Jew twice his principal, but to no avail (472, cf. IV.i.84 ff.). When the case is finally heard the Lady, who has contrived to be appointed arbitrator, reads through the Jew's bond (473, IV.i.220 ff.) and urges him to accept the offered money. He refuses, insisting always on his bond, so she bids him take his pound of flesh, and he orders the merchant to be stripped ready for the incision (473, IV.i.297-299). Then melodramatically she springs the trap. She warns the Jew that if he cuts off more or less than the exact pound of flesh, or sheds any drop of blood, he falls liable to grave penalties himself (473, IV.i.300-307). Giannetto, like Gratiano, feels considerably more hopeful at once: the Jew however goes into retreat, trying to claim the offered money or at least his principal, but he is beaten further and further down (473-474, IV.i.313, 331, 337) until he has to depart with neither money nor vengeance. After the trial the "lawyer" induces her husband to make her a gift of his betrothal

ring (474-475, IV.i.422-449), and arrives home in Belmont before him (475, V.i.89). When he arrives there along with the Donor she accuses him of infidelity, for he has surely given the missing ring to "some woman" (475-476, V.i.208); and indeed he has, without knowing it. He does not find her teasing amusing until she explains, but then all are happily reconciled (476, V.i.280-307). That there should be such a large amount of common ground between the novella and the play is a tribute to the quality of the former, as well as to the discernment of Shakespeare. The debt is so significant because it is greatest precisely at two climaxes of the story, the trial and the conclusion, whose structure and contrasting moods Shakespeare repeats in essentials.

Though he follows the narrative shape of the novella so closely, here as elsewhere the indebtedness seldom extends to verbal resemblance: only two or three instances are striking, all concerned with the Bond itself. The first concerns its terms. In the novella the parties agree that in the event of failure to repay at the proper time "the Jew might take a pound of flesh from any part of his body he pleased" (I.469), ("che'l Giudeo gli potesse levare una libra di carne d'addosso¹ di qualunque luogo e' volesse", Hazlitt, I.335). The conditions are repeated in much the same terms later (Bullough, I.471, 472: Hazlitt, I.341, 344).

¹ Sic. Should it read "addosso" as elsewhere?

Compare Shakespeare's:

Go with me to a notary, seal me there
Your single bond, and...
...let the forfeit
Be nominated for an equal pound
Of your fair flesh, to be cut off and taken
In what part of your body pleaseth me.
(I.iii.139-140, 143-146)

It is perhaps hardly surprising that the Bond itself should produce verbal similarity, but the second correspondence is more remarkable. It concerns, not the terms of the Bond, but the document recording it. Both Jews insist, obsessively, upon "the bond" or "my bond", and both are outwitted by the heroine's counter-insistence upon it. In Pecorone the Jew says "according to the bond" ("come dicono le carte", I.342), "just as my bond states" ("quel che dicono le carte mie", I.343), "as the bond states" ("quanto dice la carta", I.345), and the heroine replies "but since your bond does not mention the shedding of blood" ("però che le carte tue non fanno mentione di spargimento di sangue", I.346), "as your bond states" ("come dicono le carte tue", I.347), "to cancel your bond" ("annullare le carte tue", I.347). I have given my own translation here because Bullough's varies the rendering of "carte" whereas the repetition may be obsessive in the Jew's mouth, mocking in the heroine's. Shylock and Portia are given a similar pattern. He refers to his bond in IV.i. at lines 37, 87, 139, 202, 237, 248, 254, 257 and 313: Portia at 176, 220, 229, 244, 301 and 303. Since Shylock carries a visible stage-property bond, and both of them scrutinize it from time to time, it is clear that Shakespeare has made more than verbal use of the "bond"; but the insistence on the deceptively

definite document is based on the novella. Finally Portia's "tarry a little" spoken to Shylock at the moment of peripeteia (IV.i.300) may have been suggested by words spoken to Giannetto by the Lady just before it in Pecorone (Bullough, I.473): "wait a while". If so Shakespeare's alteration, though slight, is effective.

Since The Merchant has pronounced similarities in narrative, structure and language to the story of Giannetto, it would be surprising if these did not entail similarities of characterization. But how far do the two sets of characters resemble each other beyond the unavoidable minimum? For instance it is a structural as well as moral necessity for the Jewish usurer to be a villain, and for the suitor to be attractive and personable. Beyond that point, and the similarity of the events through which they pass, Shakespeare's pattern of indebtedness becomes strikingly asymmetrical. It will be convenient to examine first the merchant, then the suitor and his lady, and then minor characters: because the character of the Jew involves a wider range of source-reference than other characters it will be treated last and more fully.

The merchant or Donor shows the most resemblance. Ansaldo loved the younger man so deeply that he "decided to sell everything he had in the world, to equip another ship" (I.469), and in the same way Antonio assures Bassanio that

My purse, my person, my extremest means,
Lie all unlock'd to your occasions.
(I.i.138-139)

Neither man exploits the sense of obligation¹ which would naturally be aroused by such generosity. Ansaldo makes only one condition, that "should any misfortune occur, you will please come back to me, so that I may see you before I die, and with that die content" (I.469), but Antonio's words, "my bond to the Jew is forfeit; and since in paying it, it is impossible I should live, all debts are clear'd between you and I, if I might but see you at my death" (III.ii.318-321), extend Ansaldo's magnanimity because they are not a condition—he allows the possibility of his request being refused. Nevertheless the Donor's leading trait is identical, in nature and effect: this love is undemanding, ideal in the manner of romance. It is also sacrificial: when Giannetto suddenly realizes that the Bond is due to be paid he says "I greatly fear that my father will die for me" (I.471), ("ho gran dolore che mio padre moia per me", I.341). Perhaps Shakespeare was thinking of this passage, as well as the ritual and sacrificial implications of the Bond-story in general, when he made Antonio say

I am a tainted wether of the flock,
Meetest for death... (IV.i.114 f.)

The two merchants therefore have strong bonds between their characters. Shakespeare probably found the figure of Ansaldo particularly appealing because his naming of the play after Antonio implies a recognition that the Donor should be at the moral centre of events. Though Ansaldo is peripheral, he does stand to lose the most by love, for he

¹Noticeable more in Bassanio (I.i.146-152 and III.ii.263-268, 294-298) than in Giannetto.

alone risked life itself, and this significance is much more fully brought out in the play. Nevertheless in one important respect Shakespeare alters the Donor's role, since he is no longer godfather to the Beneficiary. As a result he loves the young man in friendship, not because of any more formal relationship: the effect is of course to enhance the moral attractiveness of both men, and to develop the theme of friendship alongside that of love.¹

The two Beneficiaries by contrast are very different from one another. Giannetto is a moral nonentity, a mere golden boy, who twice lies to Ansaldo in letting it be thought that shipwreck, not the conditions of the wooing-test, took away his ship and cargo (I.466 and 468). He insists on making a third expedition, though Ansaldo's means are nearly exhausted and the Flesh-Bond becomes necessary (I.469), and having succeeded he forgets Ansaldo and his danger. Almost his last action in the story is to burst into tears at the lady's teasing (I.476). Clearly Shakespeare would have to make Bassanio of stronger stuff. He is never petulant or puerile; never heedless of the Donor's welfare, so that he does not want Antonio to agree to the sinister terms of the Bond, (I.iii.149-150, 174); and has a much stronger sense of responsibility, as we see in his moved, and moving, outburst of grief when he learns of Antonio's peril (III.ii.252-328).

The character of Portia too differs radically from that of her original, some differences having been discussed already. The

¹ See below on friendship. A trace of kinship remains in the play, where Bassanio is called Antonio's "kinsman" (I.i.57).

most important remaining ones are both negative and positive. She lacks the greed of Giannetto's Lady, her duplicity, her widow's status, her anonymity, and her slightly sinister opacity of motive. She does however retain her resourcefulness, playfulness and much else that goes with disguised heroines. Positively she is given an attractive nature, established at once in the tribute of Bassanio (I.i.161-176) and the exchanges with Nerissa (I.ii). Above all, like Bassanio, she has a strong and generous sense of responsibility:

Pay him six thousand, and deface the bond;
 Double six thousand, and then treble that,
 Before a friend of this description
 Shall lose a hair through Bassanio's fault.
 First go with me to church and call me wife,
 And then away to Venice to your friend;
 For never shall you lie by Portia's side
 With an unquiet soul. (III.ii.301-308)

The contrast with Giannetto and his Lady is complete at this point.

Shakespeare has created several less prominent characters from small hints in the novella. For instance Giannetto is often accompanied by a throng of friends and admirers who are unnamed and unparticularized, but Shakespeare builds from them such characters as Salerio and Solanio, Gratiano and Lorenzo. The first two are not individualized, but the last two are. Gratiano is more garrulous and less serious than Bassanio, Lorenzo less talkative, more conventionally lyrical: both act as foils, and in addition are given a minor place in the plot, as lovers of Nerissa and Jessica respectively. Nerissa herself is an expansion of the Lady's maid in the novella who tells Giannetto to avoid the drugged posset and is married off to

Ansaldo at the end (I.470 and 476). Just as Shakespeare complicates his story by doubling the stakes of the wooing-test, he doubles the effect of female disguise and the ring-joke by having Nerissa accompany Portia to the trial. He develops the joke felicitously by making Nerissa first accuse her lover of infidelity, so that Portia can slyly affirm that her lover at least would never part with her ring (V.i.170-174). By another simple addition the Doge of Venice is made presiding judge at the trial: the inclusion of such an imposing figure adds dignity to the court's proceedings and spectacle to the visual effect.

The characterization of the Donor, and even of the Beneficiary and the Lady, needed less expansion than that of the Jew. The Jew of the novella is not named, is not introduced early and is not as fully motivated as the other main characters. It is stated once that "he wished to commit this homicide in order to be able to say that he had put to death the greatest of the Christian merchants" (I.472), but otherwise his motives are not examined. His outward demeanour alone is sketched—he heeds no plea, insists on the very letter of his bond and when thwarted even of his principal he tears up the bond in a rage (I.474). The religious fanaticism which is stated, and the ethical literalism which is implied, do make part of Shylock, for Shakespeare is as usual alert and thrifty; but they are elevated into a concentration on the Jew's motives that is not found in the Bond-tradition until now. Religious and racial pride

are in fact made the cornerstone of Shylock's personality. They permeate his actions under three main aspects: a positive pride in Jewish belief and tradition; a defensive need to preserve identity amid the hostility of gentiles; and negatively a hatred of Christians that makes him self-righteous, savage and hypocritical. Since the resulting motivation goes far to explain, if not to justify, the traditional behaviour of the Bond-holder, it is a mighty example of Shakespeare's power to develop embryonic ideas of a source into a fully realized character-conception. On the other hand he makes considerable use of his own reading to assist the process of amplification.

Some inspiration for Shakespeare's Jew may have come from Marlowe's Jew of Malta (performed frequently between 1592 and 1596).¹ This play is not a source in the sense that it provides much of the story, for the two plays share little more² than a Jewish protagonist who is wronged by Christians and seeks revenge, and has a daughter who loves a Christian. Even at the level of characterization the two plays are not very close. Barabas is himself a merchant, whose operations are felt internationally (I.i.1-137), but Shylock is only a money-lender, ghetto-oriented in influence as in thought. So while Barabas, like other Marlovian protagonists, has a high aspiring mind Shylock is less obviously a typical character of Shakespeare, and does

¹ See Introdn. to H.S. Bennett's edn., pp.1-4.

² Other correspondences of situation are discussed below, and cf. Bullough, I.454-457 and New Arden MV, p.xxxi.

not give his name to the play in which he appears. Yet in spite of these differences Shakespeare has been influenced by Marlowe. Some passages of The Merchant seem to allude to the earlier play, as when Jessica, like Abigail, throws down moneybags from her balcony to the street (II.i, MV II.vi), and when both Jews confuse their money and their daughters (which suggests that they care rather more for the former). A deeper debt is apparent however in the extent to which Shakespeare alters the effect of what he uses. His Jewess is committing her father's valuables not to him but to her lover. This borrowed action, inherently theatrical, is made to serve a more interesting characterization, for this Jewess is more spirited in love than the passive Abigail. As for the Jew's confusion of valuations, Barabas croons in joy:

O my girl,
My gold, my fortune, my felicity...
O girl! O gold! O beauty! O my bliss!
(II.i.47-48, 54)

It is amusing enough but rather straightforward. Shakespeare's humorous invention runs a good deal further in the scene where Salerio and Solanio report Shylock's confusion between ducats and daughter, perfectly epitomized in the lamentation "O my Christian ducats" (II.viii.16).

Shakespeare has discerned the dramatic potential in the Jew who, being wronged, does not show the traditional Jewish "sufferance".¹ But while neither Jew may be typical of historical

¹Jew of Malta, I.ii.170, 200-201, 239; MV I.iii.104-105, 115-124.

Jewish reactions to hardships imposed by contemporary European communities, Shylock's status and mentality are more typical than those of Barabas. Not being a merchant-potentate like Barabas, he is less socially eminent, his peril and suffering less majestic. Older, shabbier and meaner than Marlowe's proto-Rothschild he has ultimately more need of self-assertion, and clings to his separate standards because of an intense desire to survive; to keep "his separate identity in a world implacably, if reasonably, hostile to everything for which he stands."¹ So although both dramatists see that the Jew's behaviour must be explained, if not exactly justified, Shakespeare probes deeper, into that defensive rancour which corrupts Shylock's family and religious feeling, as well as prompting the particular malice of the Flesh-bond. Shakespeare's Jew seems therefore to owe less to the Jew-usurer of Pecorone than to Barabas, from whom however he is a magnificently creative divergence.

It may seem that, just as this defensive aspect of Shylock is developed by reaction from Marlowe, Marlowe inspired his positive pride in being Jewish and its particular forms of expression: Barabas too glories in descent from Abraham, and participation by descent in God's promises to that patriarch (I.i.101-104, II.iii.231); and like Shylock he trusts in the rewards promised to the righteous man (I.ii.117) and is strict about not eating pork (II.iii.7). Shylock however is more Jewish in belief and practice. One cause may be that Shake-

¹D.A. Traversi, An Approach to Shakespeare, I.198.

speare wanted to surpass Marlowe, but it is simpler to suppose that he was better acquainted with the sources of Barabas' Jewishness, and went straight back to them for details.

What were those sources? It has been debated at some length whether Jews were living in London in Shakespeare's time, or rather whether they were practising their traditional observances there; and if they were, whether they could practise openly enough for Shakespeare and his gentile audiences to know what was involved. For present purposes it seems sufficient that Jews may have been in London in the 1590s, but that they probably had to conform outwardly with the established religion. There does not seem much point in guessing that Shakespeare had esoteric knowledge of Jewish customs if his audience did not share it; and, as Cardozo shows, when other Elizabethan plays portray Jews they are non-English (often coming from Venice, as Shylock does).¹ So far as The Merchant itself suggests any particular conclusion, it must be that Shakespeare did not know Jews himself: he knows of the prohibition against pork, but apparently not of kosher dietary regulation in general. In any case no such hypothesis is necessary, for it has been proved beyond reasonable doubt by Richmond Noble² that many passages and sometimes whole scenes of the play are saturated with reference to the Bible. In the clash of faiths and ethics Shylock takes a firm stand on the Old Testament, as he understands it, the

¹Cardozo, Caps. II and III.

²In Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge, 1935.

Christians on the New Testament as well and the printed liturgy of the English church. As Noble says:

From the point of view of Scriptural quotations it is the most important of all the plays, for in it Shakespeare affords evidence of having studied the Bible closely in his delineation of Shylock. In the deal between Laban and Jacob he may be said to have used the Bible as he used Holinshed or North in other plays. Apart from Shylock the play is by no means devoid of Scripture interest. (p.161)¹

There are several aspects to the Jewish pride which Shakespeare builds up in Shylock. Besides the universal aptness in allusions to the Old Testament and in the Hebrew names, which are obvious for the most part and sufficiently tabulated in Noble (pp.161-162), four character-traits merit examination. The first is Shylock's pride in his nation and its traditions: thus he speaks of "our sacred nation" (I.iii.43, cf. Noble, pp.96-97). Deriving from this is his pride in the heroes of his nation: not so much Abraham however, with whom Barabas more typically identified, for Shylock's culture-hero is Jacob,² the significance of which will be discussed in a moment. The third trait is his "conception of righteousness as 'justice' and his belief that he was righteous because he had not offended against the law" (Noble, p.96). When Shylock claims to "stand for judgment" (IV.i.103) he is not simply insisting on the terms of his Bond but appealing to God's promises to the righteous, in the Psalms especially but also in the Pentateuch and Ezekiel. The

¹Yet somehow Shakespeare does record peculiarly Jewish characteristics, in ways for which his use of the Old Testament may not wholly account. Thus Shylock's bitter wish that his daughter were dead rather than married to a Christian (III.i.76, cf. JM IV.i.18-19) may still be endorsed by an orthodox Jewish parent: "For a child to intermarry in the Jewish religion is the greatest crime it can do to its parents. The parents sometimes would sooner the child had died than intermarry." ("Orthodox Jews in Britain--Portrait of a Community", in *The Listener*, 4.12.1969, p.788).

²E.g. I.iii.41, Jacob's wrestling; I.iii.66-92, his quarrel with Laban; II.v.35, an oath by Jacob's staff.

fourth trait is religious devotion. He goes to the synagogue (III.i. 113-114) and swears an "oath in heaven" (IV.i.223) cf. III.iii.5), with the twofold purpose of sanctifying his vengeance¹ and making any thought of clemency a dereliction of his religious duty.

These traits have no simple value in the play. They emphasize Shylock's sincerity and zeal, but also the distortions of those qualities which make him a dangerous extremist, untypical of his own people. For example his identification with Jacob shows an unscrupulous delight in deception that is more partisanship than "righteousness".² Hence his identification later, when he is angrier and more venomous, with Barabbas whom the Jews of Jerusalem preferred to Christ (Matthew XXVII.20). In the oath of vengeance religious ardour makes this Jew as cruel as the medieval Christians who used to pour out of Easter worship to initiate pogroms: it is a barely concealed duplicity by which he uses religious sanctions to excuse inhumanity. Finally his "righteousness" before the law of the state or the Jewish law shows precisely the features of Judaism against which the gospels, and therefore Portia, protest, in favour of inward righteousness and Christian mercy. Shylock is too confident in his own merit to see that he sins against the spirit of God's law, if not its letter in the sense of not actually breaking

¹Victor Hugo spoke of his bloodthirstiness becoming "sacerdotal": see New Penguin Shakespeare *MV*, ed. W.M. Merchant, 1967, p.189.

²As in Jacob's struggle with Laban, *MV* I.iii.66 ff., cf. Genesis XXX, Jacob's duplicity is still more marked in the cheating of Isaac, Genesis XXVII, and is rebuked by God in Hosea XII.2-3. A sub-plot variant is found when Launcelot's deception of Old Gobbo parodies Jacob's deception of Isaac to obtain the blessing intended for Esau: hence the joke about the extreme hairiness of Launcelot's "face" (II.ii.87). See S.M. Pitcher, "Two Notes on Shakespeare", in *PQ*, XXI, 1942, p.239.

a specific, negative injunction of the Decalogue. Hence he says "What judgement shall I dread, doing no wrong?" (IV.i.89), soon after declaring "Hates any man the thing he would not kill?" (IV.i.67). In his hatred he has defiled, and lost, his own faith, which declares "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart: thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him" (Leviticus XIX.17), and also "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the LORD require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Micah VI.8). Even more apposite, since it foreshadows the Lord's Prayer and therewith Portia's allusion to it (IV.i.195-197), is this passage from the Apocrypha: "Forgiue thy neighbour the hurt that he hath done thee, and so shall thy sinnes be forgiuen thee also when thou prayest. A man that beareth hatred against another, howe dare he desire forgiuenesse of God?" (Ecclesiasticus XXVIII.2-3, quoted by Noble, p.168). It has become important for everyone, gentile or Jew, that his stifling legalism be relaxed by some more living¹ principle.

The hypocrisy of Shylock shows a similar tightness of causation and consistency of motivation. Shakespeare had to explain how the Jew could inveigle an intelligent man, his antagonist of long standing, into agreeing to the Flesh-bond. Pecorone offered no help, for Ansaldo simply accepts the loan on the Jew's terms (I.469),

¹Hence mercy is compared to "gentle rain", IV.i.180.

leaving many pertinent questions unanswered. Shakespeare adds a good deal to his corresponding scene (I.iii). He shows the Jew tantalizing Bassanio, taking his chance to reproach Antonio and to argue the question of usury. Finally, almost incidentally, when the Christians are wondering if he will ever advance the loan, Shylock slips in the fatal condition, disguised as "a merry sport" (line 140). The phrase or the idea may have come from the Gernutus ballad:

But we will have a merry feast,
 for to be talked long:
 You shall make me a Bond (quoth he)
 that shall be large and strong.¹

If so it is almost the only use made of the ballad: this single, but crucial borrowing would suggest a flair for selecting the right detail from his reading, and an economy in not making other use of it. As for the merry jest itself, Shakespeare is perhaps wise to hurry over this decisive step because if Bassanio's misgivings (I.iii.149-150) had been prolonged into an argument we might feel more strongly that Antonio is stupid or over-confident. As it is, for all the slight implausibility, the emphasis is right: the Jew is cunning, the young hero refers to the danger, the merchant commits a slight hubris which partly justifies the Jew but which stresses also his altruism. Thus what is potentially a weak link in the story becomes--by means of judicious additions--both amusing and revealing.

¹ See New Arden MV, p.154. The ballad may however postdate and reflect the play.

One other source, more or less unconnected with Shylock's Jewishness, provides material for the Jew's climactic appearance at the trial. This is Alexander Sylvain's Orator,¹ in which Declamation 95 is called "Of a Jew, who would for his debt have a pound of the flesh of a Christian." Pecorone, as often, does not elaborate the position of the Jew: he says "I intend to do what my bond says is my right" (I.473), and the emphasis is on his stubbornness. Sylvain's Jew on the other hand has arguments as well as motives, his first words being "Impossible is it to breake the credite of trafficke amongst men without great detriment vnto the Commonwealth" (New Arden MV, pp.168-169). The same idea is used by Shylock, according to Salerio's report (III.ii.279-281), and Antonio himself testifies to the force of the argument (III.iii.26-31). Another forceful argument is transferred from The Orator to Shylock. Both Jews reason that their cruelty is nothing unusual or illegal, and no more cruel than the institution of slavery (p.169, cf. IV.i.90-98). But whereas Sylvain obscures the fact that some Christian communities tolerated slavery,² Shylock makes the charge stick (IV.i.89-102).

The effect of both borrowings from Sylvain is to make Shylock formidable, in mind as well as in motive, but also understandable. That indeed is the effect of all Shakespeare's additions

¹If the translation of 1596 is too late to have influenced the play, the French original of 1581 may have been Shakespeare's source (Bullough, I.451).

²In the same way Sylvain's Christian makes a very poor answer. When he rises above abuse to give any reason why he should be let off, he can say nothing but that since all Jews are naturally vicious and cruel, they deserve to be dispersed and (by implication) it is a Christian's duty to spare him in order to hurt this particular Jew. The talk of clemency is humbug.

to the Jew of Pecorone. His concentration on mind and motive is achieved by amalgamating disparate reading until his Jew becomes his greatest single contribution to the Bond tradition, and even one of his most memorable characters. As J.R. Brown says:

Even as a usurer, Shylock is given an opportunity to justify himself. It seems as if Shakespeare was determined not to create a "stage villain", who would always evoke a simple, hostile response. Shylock is a most complex and dominating character; he appears in only five scenes and yet for many people he is the centre of the play's interest. As an old miserly father he is comic, as a Jew he is savage and ruthless, as a usurer he seeks to ensnare the needy and Antonio, their protector. Yet in all these roles he is also a man who suffers and triumphs, speaks at times with great nobility, and has a "kind of wild justice" in his cry for revenge. (pp.xliv-xlv)

The Merchant is a convincing unity. It has often seemed otherwise to people who feel that Shylock's presence dwarfs all other interests of the play; but though his origins and character are alike complex, probably more complex than those of other principals in the drama, he is not at all isolated from its total pattern, nor does he dominate it. Artistically and ethically he belongs. Artistically he makes part of a grand combination of characters and stories, for although he appears in more than one plot, so do Portia, Bassanio and Antonio. Source-study can in fact show that although Shakespeare has heightened the role of the Jew he has done so only in the course of complicating all aspects of the Bond story--by deepening the purport of the wooing test, for instance, or by doubling the confusions regarding the ring. Ethically too Shylock does not distort Shakespeare's pattern for it is not only right that

mercy should outweigh his cruel justice, but it is felt to be right. It is true that he has been provoked and that his eventual condition is pathetic. Nevertheless the affirmation of charity is, I believe, unmistakably central, reinforced as it is by the lesson of the Caskets, and the story of Jessica. Even "lesson" is not inappropriate language here, for the ethical force of the play often finds expression in poetry or action that is emblematic. Bassanio choosing is almost Everyman:¹ Portia pleading is a spokesman for humane as opposed to subhuman values.² So rather than exposing any lack of artistic or ethical balance in the play, Shylock's character shows how well adjusted in fact the balance is.

The same balance is found if the play is approached from another direction, namely the dramatist's disposition of characters. The Merchant has a central quadrilateral, which is based on the four main characters of Il Pecorone; but whereas the four were not of equal importance in the novella, Shakespeare has made them more nearly so, for we have seen how he strengthened the character of the Beneficiary and his Lady, as well as the Bond-holder. The resulting structure and exposition point the same way: if the play were truly centred on Shylock, it would have a very strange structure, since the protagonist would be absent from the majority of scenes and especially the whole final movement.

¹As M.C. Bradbrook puts it, "His dangerous hazard brings him to a moment of blind and naked choice", (Shakespeare and Elizabethan Poetry, p.159).

²E.g. IV.i.252-256, her exchange with Shylock concerning the risk to Antonio of bleeding to death. Throughout the scene "mercy", "justice" and "rigour" are stressed, and debated as if between representatives.

The mention of a central quadrilateral might lead one to suppose that in this respect Shakespeare is drawing on his own earlier work, for The Two Gentlemen, Errors and A Dream all profit by placing a quadrilateral of characters at their centre. Yet in fact The Merchant can hardly owe much of its quadrilateral to these predecessors. Not only is that feature inherited directly from the main story-tradition, and especially from Il Pecorone: it is also a rather different kind of quadrilateral from Shakespeare's previous ones, consisting as it does, not of the interrelations and love-confusions of two men and two women, but of the love, friendship and hatred of three men and one woman. In other respects however The Merchant may be extending or varying elements which we have noticed in its comic predecessors. The most notable of these is perhaps the interest in love and friendship, discussed apropos of The Two Gentlemen and briefly noticed in our discussion of A Dream. The conflict between love and friendship, which is tangential in the former play, and is firmly subordinated in the latter (even though a little new life is injected into it since it now concerns the women characters), is not significantly reconsidered. That Shakespeare was less than ever interested in the conflict is suggested by the absence of rivalry between the claims of love and friendship in the play. The only moments where there is conflict are comic, as when Bassanio hyperbolically declares that he would give his life and wife alike if only his friend could be spared (IV.i.277-232): the effect is purely

humorous, lightening the sombre melodrama of the trial scene by means of Portia's dry comment (lines 283-284). Nor, similarly, does the episode of the rings, modelled on Il Pecorone, seriously create a division of loyalties for Bassanio. So far, then, we have traced the further decline, as far as Shakespeare's comedies are concerned, of a once venerable romance motif. But that is not to say that friendship is an irrelevant relic in the play. Far from it. Just as in The Two Gentlemen the opposition of love and friendship is considerably muted in favour of an opposition between constancy and inconstancy, between truth and treachery, so in The Merchant love and friendship are placed together in order to reinforce what really is the play's axis of conflict, namely amity, warmth and loyalty against hatred, coldness and scheming malice. That is perhaps why Shakespeare makes Shylock a loveless father (II.iii), in the added story of the Jew's Eloping Daughter, and a betrayer of Antonio's trust in his false offer of friendship (I.iii.132-137). But though some elements of Proteus, the treacherous man without faith or love (TGV V.iv.62 ff.), may have assisted the conception of Shylock, it is manifest that Shylock is a far more redoubtable, and intellectually defensible, antagonist of the comic spirit. He is a magnificent creation because he contains in one personality the threats to comic sociability which in earlier plays are divided between self-ignorant lovers, curmudgeonly fathers, rigorous rulers and their rigorous laws.

Elsewhere in the play too the alignment of love and friendship is effectual, in a way which may reflect, but indubitably surpasses, their alignment in The Two Gentlemen. If we turn our attention from the antipathetic figure to the hero, it is clear that just as Valentine's constancy in love and constancy in friendship reinforce one another, similar reinforcement is achieved by Bassanio's power to arouse affection in Antonio and Portia (not to mention Launcelot Gobbo, II.ii.108-142). Yet now the reinforcement leads to no stiffness in characterization but to a heightening of its power to carry conviction. The handling of love and friendship then is an index of how far--if there was in fact influence from The Two Gentlemen to The Merchant--Shakespeare has abandoned the conflict of love and friendship, yet thriftily profits by the distinction.

A clearer combination of thrifty conservation of old motifs with ingenious and effective new departures can be seen if we pass from considering love and friendship in the play to considering its portrayal of love without reference to its distinction from friendship. Here we have to take account not only of Shakespeare's earlier comedies, in which we notice for example the habitual collocation of conventionally Petrarchan wooing with its deflating low-life counterpart (Valentine and Proteus vis à vis Launce, the "wife" of Antipholus of Syracuse vis à vis the "wife" who lays claim to his Dromio, the four lovers in the wood vis à vis Bottom in the wood and as Pyramus). We must also take account of romance as a tradition to which such burlesquing juxtapositions are generic: Shakespeare

once more avails himself of the accommodative power of the genre, but now extends and organizes his diversity of wooing tones more fully than before. He deploys two complementary, contrasting couples to either side of Portia and Bassanio. On the one side stand Jessica and Lorenzo, who are more purely lyrical than the principals; and Bassanio and Antonio. (if we may consider them as in some sense a couple), whose affection approaches a melancholy and at times tragic intensity. On the other side stand Nerissa and Gratiano, who are lively and mocking, as often bawdy as lyrical; and the Moor and Launcelot Gobbo (III.v.32-37), who function vestigially as low-life burlesque. For the first time Shakespeare places his principals clearly in the middle of a spectrum, which is the more evidently a spectrum because there is not wooing interaction between levels;¹ and I see in this innovation a token that Shakespeare may have reconsidered the resources of romance. Perhaps part of the trouble with Valentine as a conventionally high-flown lover was that he had nobody more high-flown beyond him, to deflect the mocking effect of Launce and Speed and the greater psychological realism of Proteus. Even the quartet of lovers in A Dream still exist near one end of the scale, although "Pyramus" and "Thisbe" do at the end enable them to shed their absurdities in something yet more absurd. By contrast The Merchant offers clear gradations of tone which make Bassanio and Portia central and normative, as lovers at

¹ Contrast LLL (Armado-Jaquenetta) and MND (Titania-Bottom).

once happy, serious and playful. It is the same technique which gives the love of Rosalind and Orlando its wholesome sanity in As You Like It, poised between the reductionisms and affectations which flank them to either side. There remains of course a certain roughness in this feature of The Merchant, because for example so little is made of Gobbo's love-life; but even this shows, negatively, that Shakespeare is curbing the broad buffoonery of love-burlesque. Traditional though this had been, and useful in earlier comedies, Shakespeare has now begun to probe other, and possibly deeper, meanings of romance in conceiving finer distinctions of love-speech and love-experience. And so, like A Dream but at times surpassing it, The Merchant demonstrates how Shakespeare has been given a magnificent freedom by romance, to follow its conventions or to go beyond them according as thematic purposes require. The varieties of love not only balance but strengthen each other, in the larger purpose of presenting an ethical and emotional opposition to Shylock's rancour.

The debt to romance in respect of the harmonious variety of wooing styles is a structural one. Indeed The Merchant does not appear to satirize, or even to use, particular romance conventions so much as, say, The Two Gentlemen or A Dream. It might be otherwise if we could claim sex-disguise for a generic debt, since it is resurrected in triplicate, but of course a large part of the credit here should be given to the main story-source. Such romance motifs

as we do find--the potent dual setting (alternating between the mercantile materialism of Venice and the enchantments of love-
 imagination in Belmont), the adventurous ambience of the hazardous
 sea, the dimension of quest (made more explicit in this play than
 others by the unique references to the Argonauts myth¹)--contribute
 to tone and structure rather than to incident or plot. We can only
 guess at the reasons for the somewhat altered use of romance: was
 it perhaps the greater austerity of sens, or the reduced centrality
 of love-matters? At all events the importance of romance continues,
 in intangible but fruitful ways, and these look ahead at times to
Twelfth Night (the sea and fortune) or even beyond (the quest of
 Pericles). On the other hand in what may well be Shakespeare's
 next comedy particular motifs of romance are once more used and
 satirized, while further moulding ideas of the genre are being put
 to use.²

¹I.i.169-172, III.ii.243, cf. New Arden MV, p.lv and R.K. Root,
Classical Mythology in Shakespeare (Yale Studies in English, XIX),
 New York, 1965 (reprint of 1903 edn), p.39.

²The sources, as I understand Shakespeare's use of them, confirm the
 view that The Merchant is not primarily ironical towards the world
 of Belmont and love in which it closes. This view has however been
 challenged again recently, by A.D. Moody, Shakespeare: The Merchant
 of Venice (Studies in English Literature, No.21), 1964, who argues
 that Shakespeare, in his use of The Jew of Malta, not only humanizes
 the Jew (which is indisputable) but borrows the ironic thrust of its
 conclusion to suggest that "the seemingly godly may be more villain-
 ous than the stage-villain himself" (p.58). Whatever one may think
 of this view as a critical response to the whole play, I hope I
 have given reason in this chapter for holding that Shakespeare uses
 his sources to deepen the ethical import of the action, but to no
 very ironical, let alone satirizing, effect.

CHAPTER SEVEN

MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING: REVERSION AND FURTHER VARIATION

To approach Much Ado after The Merchant is to realize afresh the sheer variety of which Shakespeare is capable, whether of method or content, source or invention. In the face of such vitality it can be difficult to trace development within the comedies, since the new play proceeds by repetition and rejection alike, amid a fecundity of innovation and experiment. If we were to expect in the successor to The Merchant such features as dual, contrasting location, or a disguised heroine, or lavishness and variety of poetic style, Much Ado would disappoint us since they are largely absent. Yet departures from precedent may yet owe something to precedent, and so the ensuing discussion will trace how Much Ado resembles its predecessor in harnessing romance, but puts the genre to different uses. First however the story-tradition¹ will be surveyed, for, as Prouty and Bullough² have shown, Much Ado is a play in which the study of specific literary texts can illuminate with particular clarity what Shakespeare is doing. Our survey necessarily follows Prouty and Bullough to some extent, yet a number of new suggestions can, I believe, also be made.

¹Source-texts are referred to in the following edns: Ariosto's tale of Ariodante and Genevra in Sir John Harington's Translation of Orlando Furioso by Lodovico Ariosto, ed. G. Hough, 1962, IV.41-VI.16 (pp.42-62); and Bandello's tale of Timbreo and Fenicia, No. 22 in La Prima Parte de le Novelle di Bandello (1554), in the trn. of Bullough, II.112-134.

²C.T. Prouty, The Sources of MA, pp.1-64, and Bullough, II.61-81.

The story which provides the main action¹ is that of the Slandered Bride and her Credulous Groom. It has of course innumerable cognates in romance, such as the stories of Griselda and Sakuntala, or (in Shakespeare) of Imogen and Hermione, but we are not concerned now with the possible emotional resonance of such generic affinities: Shakespeare employs a variant within this always popular type of story, in which the slander is believed because the girl's fiancé sees a man entering her bedroom window and unwisely concludes that she is false to him. Versions of this story are found in the Greek romance of Chaereas and Callirhoe,² and also in the fifteenth century Tirante el Blanco by Johann Martorell³ which is the probable source of Ariosto's version in the Orlando Furioso. For our purposes it will not be necessary to go back beyond Ariosto, who initiated a large number of sixteenth century versions—including, by a route we shall trace, Shakespeare's in Much Ado.

Some features common to Ariosto's story of Ariodante and Genevra and to Much Ado may have come to Shakespeare directly from it. (There is little reason to doubt that he knew the Orlando Furioso, since Spenser did and Harington had published his translation of the whole poem in 1591). Thus Ariosto focusses attention upon his villain, Polinesso, who slanders Genevra in an attempt to

¹Even though the earliest recorded descriptions of MA refer to it as "Beatrice and Benedick", and the tendency of these characters to steal the show has continued to date, the actual events of the play—its story-line—owe more to the inherited plot of Claudio and Hero.

²Cf. E.H. Haight, Essays on the Greek Romances, New York, 1943, pp.14-37.

³Bullough, II.62.

win her for himself at any cost; and upon her handmaid, Dalinda, who is so infatuated with Polinesso that she complies with all his requests and therefore agrees to dress up as her mistress and admit Polinesso to her chamber by a ladder. In this way Ariodante is convinced that Genevra is false. Shakespeare's Don John too is a villain without redeeming features and uses the waiting-woman's gullibility for the trick by which Margaret, who is infatuated with the villain's assistant Borachio, impersonates Hero. Nevertheless Margaret, Don John and Borachio have only a limited importance in the play: Don John for example has no such motive for his trick as Polinesso. Similarly if the duels to which Claudio is challenged by Leonato, Antonio and Benedick (V.i) derive from the trial by combat of champions in Ariosto they have certainly been reduced, and altered, in significance.¹

It is in fact the Slandered Bride rather than her attendant, and the Credulous Groom rather than his deceiver, who interest Shakespeare, and their greater prominence is an indication that for most of his story he has gone to a source other than Ariosto's. Once more Shakespeare is combining sources,² the debt to Ariosto being accompanied, indeed far outweighed, by the debt to some version of Bandello's tale of Timbreo and Fenicia. There is of course no consensus on the question whether Shakespeare knew

¹The point is discussed further below, apropos of honour in *MA*.

²He was perhaps not the first English writer to do so, because George Whetstone's *The Rock of Regard* (1576) seems to owe something to Bandello as well as most to Ariosto (Bullough, II.66-67); Shakespeare however probably owes nothing to Whetstone.

Bandello in the Italian in Belleforest's French version or in some lost English translation (see above, Chapter One). But it is not imperative to identify the particular source-version in order to state and assess the significance of Shakespeare's rehandling of the story, and it will be convenient in what follows to refer to Bandello's version as his model without implying that this is the certain main story-source.

The first significant feature shared by novella and play is an emphasis. The central character is now indisputably the groom (Timbreo or Claudio), rather than the villain or the exploited attendant: thus Bandello introduces Timbreo immediately after his preliminaries, whereas Ariodante was not mentioned until some way into the story in Ariosto's version; and Bandello's story is told from Timbreo's viewpoint whereas much of Ariosto's had been narrated, in the first person, by Dalinda. The second feature is the group of characters who interact with the heroine and hero: her family, including father, mother, uncle and cousin; and his friend and rival in love. It is true that there are many differences between novella and play here, most obviously regarding the friend: Benedick is not Claudio's rival in the literal sense of seeking to steal his lady but only in the extended sense of embodying a rival attitude to life and love. Nor is he the friend and villain combined as Gironde is, in whom love at first outweighs friendship and leads him to deceit, because villainy

is placed outside the relations of love and friendship alike, in the self-isolating Don John. The villainy and rivalry of Gironde are thus divided up between two characters in the play. Yet in spite of these major differences the play quite often draws on the world of the novella for the social interactions, minor as well as major, of the hero and heroine. These will be discussed more fully in a moment. A third respect in which Shakespeare imitates Bandello, not Ariosto, is the environment of place and event: the setting in Messina, where a king of Arragon rules; the pre-play background of a war in which he has conquered; and the names "Don Pedro" from "Don Piero" and "Leonato" from "Lionato". A fourth feature is the magnanimous involvement of Don Pedro in the lovers' concerns; and a fifth is the testing of those normal values of a courtly, warrior class, personal honour and friendship. Finally Bandello and Shakespeare share a sequence of ideas: the movement in the heroine from unclouded happiness, through a shaming so traumatic as to seem like death, into a kind of new life; and in the hero from an initial uncertainty about marriage, through a betrothal, into a state where his joy evaporates along with belief in his lady's honour, and beyond that again to penitence, renewed belief and new happiness.

These common features nevertheless undergo modifications in being incorporated into Much Ado, and the modifications indicate

something of Shakespeare's distinctive view of the story he has selected. First and foremost he has a different emphasis, as regards character and event, for although his characterization is closer to Bandello's than to Ariosto's he is not consistently close to either: Claudio is not the pivotal figure which Timbreo is, because he is placed alongside added figures of equal dramatic weight. There will be occasion subsequently to discuss the effect upon Claudio's story of the presence of Beatrice and Benedick, but at least this much can be said at once, that their comments modify our attitude to his actions and reactions, from the very first (I.i.139 ff.); and that their readiness to express and exchange opinions—adroitly punished when they are tricked into love because they overhear the opinions of others—is Shakespeare's inspired extension of the theme latent in all the traditional instances of the Credulous Groom, namely the fallaciousness of accepting report, even though it be supported by striking evidence.

Events too are differently shaped in the play. The first stage of the story, concluding with the betrothal of hero and heroine, differs in two ways. Claudio does not, like Timbreo, first try to seduce the lady and only on being repulsed begin to contemplate marriage. But Claudio's courtship has a different complication to overcome, namely the doubts which lead him to suppose that Don Pedro is stealing Hero for himself (II.i.154-161). The effect of these doubts is of course to make the betrothal itself more of a

climax, but also—since they are partly self-generated¹—to suggest the forces which will more gravely disrupt the courtship at a later stage: Claudio's lack of self-confidence and his credulity (I.i.168, 185; II.i.151 ff.), which Hero's very modesty assists; and the busy malice of Don John. On the other hand, having pointed up this part of the story, Shakespeare avoids making a climax where Bandello does, namely in the deception practised upon the hero at his lady's window: Bandello's quite long and exciting sequence (Bullough, II.115-117) is truncated, since though we learn of Don John's plan beforehand (II.ii and III.ii) and of its success from Borachio afterwards (III.iii) the window scene itself has been omitted. Why should Shakespeare avoid such a naturally dramatic episode, especially since he makes effective use of a similar situation in Troilus and Cressida (V.ii)? The most likely reason, surely, is the one offered by Bullough that he wanted "to draw attention to his major theme of hearsay and false report" (II.76)—which he had emphasized in contriving Claudio's earlier loss of faith under the pressure of hearsay. A secondary reason however may well have been a desire to place his climax elsewhere, in the scene where Claudio repudiates Hero before the altar. There is no such scene in Bandello;² Claudio is more badly hurt in his self-

¹ Is Shakespeare adapting Timbreo's unremarked and unremarkable use of an intermediary in his courtship of Fenicia and in later rejecting her (Bullough, II.114 and 117) to his more inward characterization of Claudio as a diffident (and therefore vulnerable) lover?

² The villain in Whetstone's Rock of Regard at one point pretends that he desires the satisfaction of rejecting the heroine at the altar, cf. Prouty, p.25, but the parallel with MA is extremely tenuous.

esteem, more public in his rejection, and withal more cruel and self-righteous than Timbreo, who is in fact relatively discreet at this juncture (II.117-118). Shakespeare's elaborate scene, which keeps fully eight characters busy, and moves two plots decisively further, shows the resourcefulness on which Shakespeare could call when he deemed it advisable to rely on his own invention more than on his sources. In the final sequence however he once more follows Bandello; for although the vindication of the heroine's chastity is achieved by an utterly different agency, since the remorse of Timbreo's friend is replaced by the obtuse yet tenacious zeal of Dogberry, added for the purpose, the essentials are nevertheless the same in both works—the heroine's swoon and seclusion, and the hero's penitence and his marriage to a supposed kinswoman of his lady who turns out actually to be his lady.

A similar pattern of difference within dependence, though on a smaller scale, may be seen within Shakespeare's treatment of the heroine and her family, the second feature noted as being shared by the play and the novella. The heroine's role is of necessity rather a negative one: she has very little, positively, to do. Her main characteristic must be a modesty which is not sufficiently spirited to let her defend herself against accusations of immodesty,¹ but rather is so complete that she loses consciousness when it is assailed. This heroine virtually is

¹Shakespeare no doubt saw the irony.

her modesty. Shakespeare accordingly did not devote much attention to her role--in fact by eliminating any need for her to repulse illicit amours from her suitor he actually reduced it; on the other hand he makes her nature consistent, in its yielding gentleness and almost immature shyness, with her passivity.¹ As for her family, they nearly all appear, but sometimes only vestigially. Thus her mother appears in the play only as a *persona muta*, named "Innogen his [Leonato's] wife" in the initial stage-direction to I.i and elsewhere: Shakespeare must have intended to write her a part, but never did so. Fenicia's uncle Girolamo (II.121) reappears as Antonio, Leonato's brother, who resembles his original in acting from a sense of family honour; that however is more strongly emphasized by Shakespeare (V.i) than by Bandello apropos of Fenicia's uncle (II.121-122). Hero's father too has roughly the same role in both authors--the similarity being underlined by Shakespeare's retention of the name. One change should be mentioned, that by which Leonato is made the governor of Messina. It was perhaps prompted by the fact that his original was rewarded, at the end of the novella, with "a very honourable office in Messina" (II.134): nevertheless the effect of making Leonato governor throughout the action is to increase the dignity of all the parties to the matching of his daughter to Claudio, but also to render the broken engagement

¹E.g. II.i.279 ff. and III.iv.25, and cf. Bullough, II.77-78.

more catastrophic within the community as a whole.¹ Shakespeare may owe a further debt to Bandello for the Slandered Bride's cousin: just as Fenicia is accompanied by a cousin as well as by her sister when she leaves town secretly (II.122), Hero is normally accompanied by her cousin Beatrice.² In the undeveloped relationships of Fenicia Shakespeare may have found the beginnings of Hero's companions in sex and age—not only the triumphant Beatrice herself, but the other zestful ladies who trick Beatrice into wedlock.³

The third feature shared by novella and play—the setting—need not detain us, because their settings are virtually identical “but are too colourless for the fact to be of much importance. On the other hand the fourth feature, the role of the King of Arragon, is significantly altered by Shakespeare. Whereas Don Piero had no part in Bandello except to initiate and conclude the love story (II.113, 132-134), Shakespeare's Don Pedro participates fully in the action. Not married himself, though Don Piero was, he appears to take a pleasure in match-making; not only by acting as Claudio's intermediary⁴ to Leonato

¹Hence the Governor, of all people, has to resort to duelling to gain redress (V.i).

²I.i.30, and cf. the initial stage direction in both Quarto and Folio, “Enter Leonato...and Beatrice his neece....”

³Ursula and Margaret, the latter of course functioning also in the Hero-Claudio plot as Borachio's decoy.

⁴This function may have been suggested by Timbreo's use of an intermediary (II.114), but if so Shakespeare is dignifying and extending its effect.

but by originating and engineering the matching of Benedick with Beatrice (II.i.329-334). His illegitimate half-brother, whose actions derive in part from the deceptions practised in Ariosto and Bandello but whose motives and whole nature are Shakespeare's addition, takes an equal and opposite pleasure in unmaking a marriage. Thereby he defines and (since his code of behaviour is morally sterile) vindicates the attitude to marriage of his brother. So the royal brother upholds social order,¹ including wedlock, whereas the bastard naturally resents wedlock and the society which sanctions it (I.iii.39-41), speaking instead for anarchic self-assertion (I.iii.8-33). The moral symmetry here is wrought entirely by Shakespeare's rearrangement of elements, like the ruler, his wars and the villain, which were present in the story-tradition, but unconnected and unexpressive.

There are felicitous innovations in Don Pedro's other relationships too, for example in those with Beatrice, Claudio and the elderly brothers. The effect is at times to qualify one's approval of the affable monarch. Thus Beatrice flirts with him, but--revealingly--withdraws her interest, saying "Your Grace is too costly to wear every day" (II.i.294): though her chatter should not be pressed for meaning, as she herself admits (II.i.297), we gather that in general she is more clear-sighted than most, and has some reservations about Don Pedro. Has she

¹As also in the war concluded just before the action begins (I.i.1-14). Shakespeare probably drew this aspect of Don Pedro from Don Piero, who had restored peace after the infamous Sicilian Vespers (II.112), though the war of MA is of course different.

perhaps detected his touches of complacency and his ultimate aloofness?¹ Nor does he emerge with much credit from his encounters with Leonato, Antonio and Benedick after the wedding fiasco (V.i.46-185). On the other hand Don Pedro is obviously not a fool. His main effect upon the play is to lend it the dignity of majesty; a military competence and civil authority, antithetical to the Bastard's anarchy; and above all an example of friendly magnanimity. Such is of course the effect of Don Piero upon the novella, but Shakespeare heightens the effect by giving Don Pedro much more to do. Moreover the heightening has an important effect elsewhere because the prince's magnanimity, as he intervenes on Claudio's behalf, and his approval of Claudio's act of repudiation, gain more conviction for Claudio's good faith. (Shakespeare has in this way as in others strengthened the grounds on which the Groom believes the slander).²

The fifth feature we noticed, a tacit acceptance of personal honour as a guide to conduct, is less clearly present in the play than in the novella, notwithstanding the soldierly camaraderie which binds the young men to Don Pedro and to each other (I.i), and which is the first attribute we notice concerning them. There can be little doubt that this camaraderie comes from the story-tradition, since Timbreo and his friend Gironde have just distinguished themselves in Don Piero's wars (II.113 and 114).

¹See also G.K. Hunter, William Shakespeare. The Late Comedies, p.24.

²See K. Neill, "More Ado about Claudio: An Acquittal for the Slandered Groom", ShQ, III, 1952, pp.97, 101-107. The whole article (pp.91-107) is an important contribution to the interpretation of the story-tradition and of Shakespeare's use of it.

Nevertheless Shakespeare is making a number of changes, whose effect is to imply a different ordering of values. The first change, as we saw, was to eliminate the double standard which had governed Timbreo's sexual behaviour: so far Claudio's sense of honour is more satisfactory. Secondly, however, Shakespeare does not allow friendship between men to outweigh a man's love for a woman, although Timbreo like Valentine in The Two Gentlemen had offered his repentant friend his own lady (II.125). Since no second man loves Hero, the classic form of conflict between love and friendship is largely avoided: the avoidance which has been sensed in other comedies subsequent to The Two Gentlemen is more evident in Much Ado because the conflict was integral to Timbreo's story. The only occasions where the conflict does appear are when Benedick has to choose between believing in Claudio or in Beatrice (IV.i.261 ff): he has no difficulty in choosing, once he is sure she is in earnest (line 325), and has in any case a predisposition to believe in Hero's innocence (lines 188, 259). Subsequently (all this being Shakespeare's extension of the story) Benedick makes it clear that he forswears the company of his former friends, including Don Pedro himself (V.i.178 ff): implicitly he is abandoning loyalty to his friends for a higher loyalty to his lady, in what hints at a redefinition of "honour".

The last feature which is shared by Much Ado with the novella and to a lesser extent with the story-tradition as a whole,

is the movement in the hero through error to knowledge, and in the heroine through apparent death to renewal. The sense latent in such a movement of events is seldom developed much in the tradition; but with some assistance from romance and other genres, and also from his own earlier comedies, Shakespeare develops the ideas considerably. Since their degree of dependence on the story-tradition varies, it will be convenient to discuss these shaping ideas in order of decreasing dependence on the tradition, thus: knowledge and renewal, then their correlatives error and evil.

The question how one can distinguish knowledge from opinion,¹ truth from hearsay and downright lies, is endemic to the situation of the Slandered Bride. In every version of the story the hero must be brought to trust the word of a man friend, supported by evidence, in preference to a lover's implicit trust of his beloved. Yet in two respects we can see how Bandello's version could stimulate Shakespeare the most.

First he makes the deception of the hero involve more indirection. The false friend works on Timbreo by means of intermediaries (II.115-117), one to tell him his lady is untrue, another to be seen at the window. So the evidence becomes more circumstantial, and the hero has less reason to suspect, even though knowledge is more than ever lacking. Secondly Bandello nevertheless emphasizes Timbreo's repentance, and gives it an appropriate form:

¹As Claudio asks of Don John, "How know you he loves her?" (II.1.146).

Timbreo promises the heroine's father to marry only on his advice and gift (II.126), that is, to show the extreme of trust precisely where he had formerly no trust.

Shakespeare retains the moral contours of the tradition, while extending details of Bandello's treatment of it. Indirection is used, for Claudio has little reason to suspect Don John of being in league with the man at the window; and the evidence is rendered more circumstantial by the inclusion of the detail, (not from Bandello but from Ariosto, Orlando Furioso V.24-26), that the decoy wears the heroine's clothes (V.i.224). The fallibility of hearsay evidence is however underlined by other details which Shakespeare has added, presumably for the purpose: the conflicting reports concerning Don Pedro's intentions towards Hero (I.i.271, I.ii, I.iii.52-55), together with Claudio's diffident, suspicious reactions, (II.i.139-161) so predictive of his misplaced doubt later. The role of opinion, and the difficulty of knowing, is in fact almost emblemized in the masked ball (II.i), in which so many people, some of them outside the Hero-Claudio plot, mislead or are misled: here Shakespeare develops the opportunities for disguising and comic mistake which he had exploited only a little in the masquing of Love's Labour's Lost (V.ii.158-309). Similarly, while giving to Claudio a movement like Timbreo's, out of suspicion into repentance and an atoning gesture of trust, Shakespeare makes that gesture more emblematic: Claudio must swear to marry Hero's "cousin" before he sees her face (V.iv.55-59). Her masking here

recalls the earlier masking, but the controlling mood is blind trust where before it was promiscuous opinion.

Beyond these additions however lie greater ones-- Beatrice and Benedick, Dogberry and the Friar--which amplify the play's consideration of opinion and knowledge; and although we cannot analyse fully here all the ways in which they modify what is drawn from the story-tradition, we must at any rate suggest how these potent additions not only lighten but also deepen the sens of Much Ado. Dogberry for example has the most absurd methods for discriminating between Knowledge and Opinion, for he does every kind of violence to language (supposedly the servant of right knowing) and yet it is he after all who apprehends the malefactors and so makes possible the four lovers' happiness. As Traversi puts it, "'Asses' though they may appear in the eyes of the sophisticated, Dogberry and his fellows yet cling to reality as they understand it... [and] are seen to be instruments of truth; the contrasted facets of appearance and fact, pretension and reality, which answer to the comic method of this play are nowhere more tellingly exemplified" (An Approach to Shakespeare, I.295-296). Beatrice and Benedick too are wise in their foolishness, Albeit they do not fully know themselves or each other, until their friends' intriguing and the pressure of grave events makes them abandon the masks which they have in wilful self-defence adopted, they are far from blind to the moral nature of the people around

them. Both of them show detachment from the slight complacency of Don Pedro; it is Benedick who first divines that the repudiation of Hero may ultimately be the handiwork of Don John (IV.i.188); and Beatrice who sees past the structure of evidence and report by which Claudio (and Don Pedro) justify the repudiation to the meanness and ill-will of so publicly humiliating Hero.¹ Finally the Friar, the most disengaged character, represents experience and study, mutually tested—a sounder road to judgment, which is conspicuously ignored by the hasty, proud sensibilities of the courtiers;

Trust not my reading nor my observations,
Which with experimental seal doth warrant
The tenour of my book; trust not my age,
My reverence, calling, nor divinity,
If this sweet lady lie not guiltless here
Under some biting error.

(IV.i.165-170, italics mine).

There is economy, wit and perhaps profundity in the way these four added characters, so unlike each other, combine to expose the slander and the inadequacy of the hero's acceptance of it.

In the theme of renewal, which yields a strong antithesis of death and life, Shakespeare is again drawing out of the story-tradition its inner significance, although this time he more evidently supplements material from the tradition with generic materials and ideas present in his own earlier comedies. In

¹In this respect Claudio's actions are markedly different from those of the discreet Timbreo.

Ariosto there is an apparent death and a rebirth, that of Ariodante (Orlando Furioso, VI.3-13); but there is little suggestion of such a movement for his lady Genevra. Much Ado is of course concerned with the renewal of Claudio's infected imagination,¹ and the revival of its capacity for love, but the emphasis on rebirth is elsewhere--not least because Claudio, unlike Ariodante or Timbreo, does not repent of his unbelief until the deceiver's confession convinces him (V.1.231-238). Rebirth is more noticeable apropos of Hero, and to this emphasis Bandello rather than Ariosto may have contributed. From the moment when Timbreo gives way to jealous distrust of Fenicia (II.116) the language of the novella² repeatedly opposes death with life. Thus we read that Timbreo "seemed more dead than alive" (II.116); "Fenicia stood as though stricken dead, as did her father and mother" and "...regaining life and breath...Lionato said..." (II.118); Fenicia "lost control of herself and thought death now more to be desired than life...she let herself sink down like a dead woman" (II.119); "She gave herself up to death" (II.120); "'You have been so deeply aswoon that we thought you were dead, but, praise God, you are still alive'" (II.121); "what

¹Cf. the Friar's words, discussed further below, at IV.1.224-230; and Claudio's at V.1.232 ("I have drunk poison", and 237-238 ("Sweet Hero, now thy image doth appear / In the rare semblance that I lov'd it first"). Cf. also J.R. Mulryne, Shakespeare: Much Ado about Nothing, 1965, pp.43-44.

²To make sure that Bullough's translations of "death" and "life" and their cognates are literal I have consulted the Italian, using the text of W.C. Hazlitt, Shakespeare's Library, III.104-136.

would you have done to have her alive again?" and "...if I could have brought back the maid who is dead, I would have given half of my lifetime to have her restored..." (II.129-130). Yet the antithesis remains colloquial most of the time (just as we say in English "more dead than alive"), or else conventionally pathetic: its impact is muted by the fluent, unemphatic run of the prose, and further muted because Fenicia "dies" twice and her parents too "die" of horror and amazement (II.118). The antithesis therefore accumulates no resonance or vitality, indeed barely rises to the status of significant metaphor.

Shakespeare on the other hand brings out such a significance firmly. Whether or not Bandello has prompted him he probably draws on other sources, such as stories of a slandered wife,¹ who is as it were reborn to honour out of a calumny death-like in its injustice; the resurrective nature of comedy, as exemplified in the St. George plays or the escapes of Mr. Punch;² his own Errors, which concludes with Egeon's rescue from death and with his sons' baptismal feast, or The Merchant, in which Antonio is likewise rescued and declares later that Portia has given him "life and living" (V.1.286); and romance, a frequent feature of which is an emergence out of disgrace, danger or oblivion--felt as near-equivalents of death--into a new and happier life.³ In most of

¹Cf. N. Frye, A Natural Perspective, New York, 1965, pp.63-64, who compares Hero to Sakuntala.

²Cf. C.L. Barber, Shakespeare's Festive Comedy, (p.205, for St. George and Falstaff) and N. Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, pp.178-179 for the "point of ritual death" often found in comedy.

³E.g. the tale of Apollonius of Tyre and his family.

these possible sources (which are constantly overlapping with one another) the conception of rebirth is crude, vague or inarticulate; and where, as in Book I of The Faerie Queene, it is mature and clear it is because the presence of allegory allows it to receive the full weight of resurrection in the received religious tradition.¹

Shakespeare, as we might expect, avoids both extremes, adding art, clarity and weight to the rebirth of Hero without allegorizing it or including specifically Christian terminology. Thus the Friar, whom we have already seen to possess a presiding, normative wisdom, is a natural mediator of grace and new life; yet although it is he who introduces and expounds the idea of rebirth, it is not done in explicitly Christian categories, but with the unspecific solemnity and reverence proper to any birth.

But not for that dream I on this strange course,
 But on this travail look for greater birth.
 ...Th'idea of her life shall sweetly creep
 Into his study of imagination,
 And every lovely organ of her life
 Shall come apparell'd in more precious habit,
 More moving, delicate, and full of life,
 Into the eye and prospect of his soul,
 Than when she liv'd indeed.

(IV.i.212-213, 224-230)

The insistence here on "life" and its cognates, and the vigour of

¹The Red Cross Knight is brought close to death by Despair (I.ix.50), from which he is revived by Una (ibid., 52-53) and by his stay in the House of Holiness (I.x); later, in his three-day battle with the Dragon he is revived by the Well of Life (I.xi.29) and by the Tree of Life (ibid., 46). These details allegorically represent the life of the Christian pilgrim following the pilgrimage of Christ himself.

life, on the wonder equally of the revival and of its reception by the imagination of Claudio, surely anticipates the coming to life of Hermione's statue; and if the beholders, notably Claudio, respond in imagination by wondering acceptance, then they too may be reborn, in the purging of that imagination or "eye of the soul", which has first offended and brought the death of love. Hence before Hero reappears Claudio undergoes a change of heart (V.i.231 ff) and expresses this in public (lines 257 ff.). Moreover he expresses it again, more ritualistically, at a tomb¹ which the audience knows to be empty (V.iii), and at an hour which changes in the course of the scene from night to dawn (V.iii.24 ff.): the Christian overtones, which were present but not insistent in the Friar's role, are continued in these images of resurrected love. When Hero reappears her first words to Claudio (her first to anyone since the scene of her disgrace) allude both to the continuity and to the renewal of their lives:

And when I liv'd I was your other wife;
And when you lov'd you were my other husband.
(V.iv.60-61)

The insistence on life growing out of death continues as Hero declares "One Hero died defil'd; but I do live" (line 63) and fruition in wonder is emphasized by the Friar—"meantime let wonder seem familiar" (line 70). Then the love-relationship of Beatrice and Benedick, though it has not evolved through death,

¹The tomb and the hero's penitence there are in *Bandello*, but not the more evocative circumstances: the scene of repentance at Fenicia's tomb takes place, rather prosaically, at dinner time (II.123).

is also termed a "miracle" (line 91)—for self-knowledge in the mutual recognitions of love is a miracle, both by its own nature when that is fully realized and because it is reached by the overcoming of mighty obstacles in the self; in which respect both pairs of lovers have had much to learn and overcome.

Whereas the themes of knowing and rebirth owe a good deal to the story-tradition, their negatives, error and evil, owe less. For error Shakespeare probably owes a good deal to his own earlier work: to put it in a formula, all this *ado* is another comedy of errors. More specifically these lovers' errors extend the questionings of Love's Labour's Lost and A Dream: although there are continuities between, say, Lysander and Claudio or Berowne and Benedick the errors are now more clearly than ever mental and internal, not circumstantial and external. Moreover a careful discrimination of types of erroneous loving, is now conducted: whereas all four bookmen, or all four lovers in the wood, erred in the same way, Claudio's mode of error is by no means Benedick's.¹

Evil in Much Ado is less often discussed than error, but until The Merchant Shakespeare had not often availed himself, for his comedies, of the generic interest of romance in evil. Two forms of that interest are relevant: a straightforward capacity to include a villain, who may be redeemed or destroyed indifferently

¹The charting of love's errors in the play is more fully discussed by J.R. Brown, Shakespeare and his Comedies, pp.109-123.

at the end; and a more pervasive interest in the springs of the evil which defines the virtue tested in a romance. In The Merchant Shakespeare rather suddenly employs both aspects of the generic villain (the contrast with A Dream preceding it is startling), and Don John to some extent continues the thinking which produced Shylock. Nevertheless evil in Much Ado has a different effect from evil in The Merchant: here too Shakespeare's repetitions accommodate new departures.

It is true that Don John, like Shylock, is antisocial from first to last and his insistence on the prior claims of self (I.iii.8-33) runs counter to the nature of love as explored in the play: there is a similar emphasis on his self-isolating rancour, which provides a polar opposite to love and gaiety. Don John will not dance, hates marriage and grudges words that do not further his gloomy purposes. And yet he is not the mighty opposite to love and sociability that Shylock is, and for a very good reason. What he does is to initiate forces in the action which are corrosive of happiness, but which will actually corrode it only if other characters, by their own deficiencies, allow them to: the greater weight of the sens rests upon these deficiencies, in the lovers and their society, which the irruption of malice tests. In other words whereas in The Merchant love is first achieved, and then enlarged by the conflict with Shylock's contrasting ethic, in Much Ado love only seems to be achieved by Claudio and Hero before

its fragility is exposed by evil. (By an irony that is technically dexterous but emotionally profound the same test has the opposite effect on the other lovers, for Beatrice and Benedick confess love for each other, and prove their abandonment of self-love by actions, as soon as Claudio has repudiated Hero at the altar.) Love, it seems, has inherent vulnerabilities--not only the subjectivism of A Dream, but uglier diseases like jealousy and false pride. Because the slanderer, playing upon these, can let the victim do most of his work for him, the threat to love is stronger than in any previous comedy: when the roots of love appear to be entangled with those of self-love we are on the way not only to Malvolio but to Othello, Lear and Leontes. The sense of Much Ado is therefore ambitious, since error and evil are for the first time related in Shakespearean comedy; but this formidable bond is also counterweighted by Shakespeare's most extended comic exploration to date of moral and metaphysical rebirth.¹

Yet while these themes contain a good deal that is new to Shakespeare's comedies, their precondition, or vehicle, is a structure which is partly owed to that of earlier comedies. Thus the movement described in terms of event as death and rebirth, and in terms of character-consciousness as self-discovery, depends on a structure of characterization which owes a good deal to the

¹ Evil and rebirth are ironically linked when Don John asks, concerning Borachio's plot, "What life is in that, to be the death of this marriage?" (II.ii.17-18). To his twisted mind what is normally considered life-enhancing spells death, and conversely: so his evil defines, by opposing, a meaning of the play as a whole.

romance genre, especially as that genre had been interpreted by Shakespeare himself in earlier comedies. Once again thematic exploration centres on a quadrilateral of lovers (another reversion from the structure of The Merchant to that of A Dream). The quadrilateral involves no interchange of partners, but—as in The Shrew—a strong contrasting of couples. Shakespeare had done this many times before, but seldom so strongly. Instead of the relatively undifferentiated lovers of A Dream, and perhaps extending his more elaborate spectrum in The Merchant, Shakespeare builds the whole action from the contrasted wooing styles and experience of Beatrice and Benedick on the one hand and of Hero and Claudio on the other. His method is once more a creative use, rather than a slavish repetition, of the convention of romantic love-behaviour; but his contrast is not the opposition of a conventional with an unconventional couple. Instead he contrasts two kinds of extreme, neither being conventional to romance: the one extreme being taciturn in manner and diffident in nature while the other is garrulous and self-confident.¹ The action thus becomes the elegant, interweaving dance by which the two couples move, by diametrically opposite routes, towards the common goal of love in marriage.

Both couples are also in part defined by their stance vis à vis the romance conventions of love-behaviour. While Claudio

¹Gratiano, as well as Berowne, may have gone to the invention of Benedick.

on the whole follows social rather than literary conventions of courtship he indulges at times a Petrarchan lover's absolutism: "In mine eye she is the sweetest lady that ever I look'd on" (I.i.161). Benedick, as yet fancy-free, makes a crushingly realistic rejoinder: "I can see yet without spectacles, and I see no such matter" (I.i.162). Benedick (and Beatrice) cannot however persist in such an antiromantic position, to which in any case Shakespeare gives an element of perverseness and theatricality, (I.i.144-145). Outright rejection of romance assumptions, expressed by Benedick in I.i.196 ff. and by Beatrice in II.i.23-55, later becomes a self-amused interest (II.iii.212-end); then an acceptance of the "need" to compose verses (V.ii.27 ff.), which becomes increasingly delighted until it is by a form of love-declaration so utterly conventional as verses composed in each other's praise that their love is made public knowledge (V.iv.85-90)—a "miracle" indeed. The conversion of Cupid's enemies into his devotees is complete; or would be if their use and enjoyment of romance convention did not include self-mockery and so remained partially critical. Compared with previous conversions, such as Valentine's or Berowne's, it is more gradual, and also more closely integrated with character-development, since the diffident Claudio prefers social to literary conventions of courtship and it is the outspoken opponent of romantic love who has to eat his words. Yet he does so blithely, and turns Don Pedro's teasing back upon him (V.iv.98-119).

Other features of romance are present but can be dealt with summarily. Disguise is not present in the primary sense, but in two new variations: the masked dance of II.i, involving all the principals in varying degrees of misunderstanding, and the figurative disguise of Beatrice and Benedick as opponents instead of lovers. All the disguises are deliberate, yet all have consequences beyond the disguisers' power to foresee or control--which excellently suits a play in which the wise are shown foolish and rejoice to be so, while what the wise could not discover shallow fools bring to light (V.i.218-230). It is the same wit and wisdom by which Bottom alone beholds the celestial vision which the dance of comedy betokens (A Dream IV.i.204 ff.).

Generically then romance has much the largest role, but on occasion other genres contribute. Festive and folk tradition may have contributed something to the flyting characters, and possibly to the villain and his drunkenly incompetent assistant. Intrigue models may have provided a hint or two for the conspiracy against Beatrice and Benedick, or for the stupid constabulary.¹ Lyly could have provided inspiration for the placing and purging of witty folly. Nevertheless these other genres do not contribute so much, singly or jointly, to Much Ado as romance does. The counterweight to romance (which the present chapter may seem to have overstressed because it has necessarily treated at some length of a main story-tradition which is itself romantic) is

¹Cf. Bullough, II.69. Other sources may have been LLL (Dull), or Lyly's Endimion.

provided by the story of Beatrice and Benedick; for although this has its own romance aspects, which indeed need more consideration than they normally receive, its lively prose repartee bulks large in everyone's apprehension of the play, and must still be credited to Shakespeare's own invention above all. It is in the balance of their quizzical criticism of the forms of romance with their ultimate acceptance of its spirit that Much Ado achieves its most brilliant success; and even if this success is not one which contributes so fully to Shakespeare's use of romance after our group of comedies as do its more manifestly romantic affiliations, it certainly helps Shakespeare's fusion of romance with the criticism of romance in As You Like It. But before coming to As You Like It I consider The Merry Wives of Windsor, in order to stress that comic diversity is found as between comedies as well as within them, and that this diversity is accompanied by diversity of source-relationships.¹

¹I do not suggest that the order of discussion (MA, MWW, AYL, TN) is also chronological, although (cf. Cap. 1) it may be.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR AND ITS

EMPLOYMENT OF INTRIGUE MODELS

The Merry Wives has three main distinguishing features of source-relationship, as we noted in Chapter One: generic affiliation with intrigue and fabliau, much more than with romance; dependence on types of story, in an indirect way, not the more usual direct dependence on story-sources or at least story-traditions; and an especially evident degree of self-borrowing, from the Henry IV plays. In the ensuing discussion, although all three features should be considered it will be convenient to concentrate on the stories and self-borrowings: the debts to fabliau and intrigue are naturally examined in connection with the stories, because these, by their multiplicity of common and typical features, and lack of specific correspondence with The Merry Wives, draw our attention to typical elements and assumptions of their genre. Then once the stories and their genre have been surveyed, we can assess how far genre also modifies Shakespeare's self-borrowings.

The story-line of the play has four main components: a) the tricking of Falstaff and Ford by the Merry Wives and their assistants; b) the triple wooing of Anne Page; c) the horse-stealing; and d) the "fairy" scenes at the end. The four are not, however, of equal importance in themselves, nor of equal relevance for our purposes. The Wives' stratagems form the main plot, as one would suppose from the fact that they supplied Shakespeare with his title; and so their predecessors and

analogues may appropriately be discussed first and most fully. Anne Page's wooing and its attendant intrigues are second in importance, but by no means minor, being interwoven with the main plot from first to last; and here too predecessors and analogues may be discerned. These will be discussed second and somewhat less fully. But the third plot, the horse-stealing episodes, is not significant for our discussion, since its function and purport are not clear in the Quarto and Folio texts as these survive; moreover the sources are not literary but (almost certainly) topical,¹ and therefore excluded from our purview (see Chapter One). The fourth component once more has several, and interesting affinities, in tracing which we shall see further evidence of Shakespeare's power to combine disparate materials; but since the fairy scenes are an episode rather than a plot, they will be considered after our account of the main plot and sub-plot, and then more briefly.

The gulling story of the main plot is related to an enormous wealth of fabliaux, going back at least as far as the Middle Ages. Because these fabliaux overlap so much with one another, some means is needed of distinguishing the related sub-types of story and the particular story-tradition from the broad mass of gulling stories. Bullough usefully writes:

Medieval story included many tales of gallants who, seeking to seduce other men's wives, were interrupted and hidden in strange places. Usually such tales fall into two classes: (i) those where the gallant is welcome and his misadventures lead to his success, the fun being mainly at the husband's expense; (ii) those where the suitor is unwelcome and the wife makes him ridiculous and uncomfortable. (II.4-5)

¹Bullough (II.4 and 11-16) summarizes the textual problems and discusses the topical events involving Frederick Count Mompelgard. Fuller discussions of these matters include those of H.C. Hart, ed. Arden *MW*, 1904; W.W. Greg, ed. *Shakespeare's MW*, 1602, Oxford, 1910, esp. Introdn.; and W. Green, *Shakespeare's MW*, Princeton, 1962.

This passage not only shows that in the stories of the Interrupted Lover there are two broad classes, with somewhat different viewpoints and sympathies, but also implies that The Merry Wives has affinities with both classes. The fact appears to me of the greatest importance for discerning the play's contribution to the tradition it uses, and we must raise the matter again later. For the moment however Bullough's two classes are to be considered separately.

Among tales of an Interrupted Lover which stress the duping of the Husband, the earliest we need consider is that in the fourteenth century Il Pecorone (I.2, translated by Bullough, II.19-26). A Professor of Law undertakes to instruct his student, Bucciolo, in the art of love. But he is soon disturbed to find that the lady whom the pupil has (without knowing her identity) courted and won is his own wife; and grievously discomfited when he tries to catch the pair together. Stress is placed upon the husband's descent from complacency to frenzy, but more specifically upon the humorous irony of the pupil's bettering his instruction at the teacher's expense; and also upon the wife's ingenuity in contriving that her lover shall escape. There are two such escapes, once when he hides "under a heap of newly washed clothes--sotto un monte di panni di bucato" (Bullough, II.23), and once when she hides him behind her back in the dark street-doorway. Another effective feature of the story is that the wife's brothers, whom the husband summons to witness her infidelity, conclude rather that he is mad. (II.25).

A number of points here suggest comparison with The Merry Wives--the lover's unwittingly confiding in the husband; the two escapes; the pile of linen as hiding-place, with "bucato" possibly

being echoed in "buck-basket" (III.iii.2, III.v.80, etc.); and the talk of madness. Moreover it seems likely, as we argued apropos of The Merchant of Venice, that Shakespeare knew Il Pecorone. Nevertheless we cannot conclude that the story of Bucciolo is his main story-source for The Merry Wives, since most of the shared features can be paralleled in other versions of the story, composed between Il Pecorone and Shakespeare's comedy. The few features which are not prevalent, such as the number of escapes (usually three rather than two)¹ and the possible verbal link could well be accidental, and in any case appear somewhat trivial. It is necessary to consider the story-tradition as a whole rather than this particular member of it. The prevalent features on the other hand, even if they prevent us identifying a particular main source, point to what is most enduring in the tradition.

Italian versions subsequent to Ser Giovanni's include those of Straparola (Le Piacevoli Notti, 1550-3, IV.4), Doni (Rime del Burchiello, 1553), and Fortini (Le Giornate de' Novizi):² and an English version which Shakespeare could very easily have known is the final story in Tarlton's News out of Purgatory (1590), ("The Tale of the Two Lovers of Pisa"). The common and essential features of these versions are: (a) the Husband's complacency as instructor in love, turning to suspicion; (b) the Lover's successive and varying escapes, which he owes to the Wife's brazen cleverness (and the Husband's

¹ But Doni's version also has two escapes; see R.S. Forsythe, "MW: Two New Analogues", FQ, VII, 1928, pp.390-398.

² For Doni and Fortini I have relied on the material included in R.S. Forsythe, *op.cit.* Fortini's version was written in or after 1555, though not published till later.

stupidity in assuming he will be tricked a second time in the same way); (c) the calm way he inadvertently narrates them to the Husband; (d) the Husband's jealous fury, which in the absence of ocular proof appears to others as insanity; and (e) the attendant jokes about cuckold's horns, for the Lover always enjoys the lady at least once.¹

The Merry Wives, in its turn, employs most of the above motifs. (a) Ford is scarcely complacent of course; nor does he advise the lover since Shakespeare has reversed this part of their relations. But his suspiciousness is stressed from the beginning by its contrast with Page's assurance (II.i). Here Shakespeare omits one traditional trait but by a judicious addition emphasizes another.

(b) The escapes of Falstaff, as the Lover, likewise begin from the tradition but make an ingenious new contribution to it. Bucciolo in Pecorone hides under a heap of clothes, while Nerino in Straparola's version hides in a chest which is itself hidden by old clothes;² but Falstaff's refuge in the buck-basket manifestly surpasses both. The clothes are definitely dirty at last, so that the lover's physical hardships are being developed as well as the husband's mental distress; and there is the theatrical bonus that we see the servants toiling out to Thames-side with the overloaded basket. A further improvement of Shakespeare's is the introduction of disguise as the means of Falstaff's second escape, replacing the tradition's rather repetitive hiding-places (behind curtains or in wardrobes), or

¹ Commonly, though not universally or necessarily, the Lover employs an old woman as go-between at first (see Pecorone, Straparola and Fortini versions). Shakespeare uses the page Robin instead (I.iii), but Mistress Quickly is commissioned by the Wives to carry their reply to Falstaff (II.ii).

² W.G. Waters, tr. The Nights of Straparola, 2 vols., 1894, I.203-204.

too straightforward running away in the dark. Moreover Falstaff's disguise--as a woman, notable only for obesity--again tends towards the ignominious; and of course he gets a beating into the bargain from Ford (IV.ii). So Shakespeare both enlivens the mechanics of the traditional story and modifies its sympathies. Similarly although the escapes originate as heretofore with the Wives, not with the Lover, their mood and motives are altered--a point to which we must return in a moment (see (d) and (e)).

(c) The confidences of the Lover to the Husband reappear in the play, and again provide strong, diverting ironies: the laugh is from the beginning against both men in these stories, though before Shakespeare the Husband incurred more ridicule at all stages than the Lover. Shakespeare alters the irony somewhat, since Ford does not gradually discover whom Falstaff is wooing, but he knows what is afoot (thanks to Pistol). On the other hand he is in disguise, as "Brook", whenever he interviews Falstaff. The change here is not necessarily an improvement, but its irony is at least equally amusing, and also enhances the play's (numerous) other disguises. Moreover it contributes signally to Shakespeare's very individual structure of gulling, in which the Lover and the Husband conspire against one another, using rather than honouring the Wives, but the latter, whose aims are the more honourable ones of merriment and eventual harmony, outwit them both.

(d) and (e) Ford in his jealousy follows a similar course to his predecessors, (as do his friends in their imputation of insanity (IV.ii.109), except in three things. First, his progress in frenzy is treated in more detail than the novella form could admit: Shakespeare

plots in the first rumblings (II.i), the mushroom growth of Ford's fixed idea (II.ii.252 ff.),¹ and the illuminating tranquillity of the juxtaposed Page. Second, the well-worn jokes about cuckold's horns are given new life by Ford's delirious obsession with them (III.iii. 137 ff.). Third and most significant, Ford is actually not cuckolded. Though Ford goes through wilder torments than his forerunners, they are nevertheless self-torments. So while the humour of the husband's suspiciousness remains much as in the tradition at large, indeed is hilariously expanded, there is a difference in its overall effect. Ford would surely not be ridiculous if his fears were to prove justified. What the Wives set out to do is threefold: to be merry, for that is their keynote and the play's; to pay out Ford for his jealousy; and to cure Falstaff's lust by ridicule. Now Ford is punished sufficiently by his two failures to catch Falstaff, and the consequent disgrace, so that he repents comparatively soon (IV.iv). Being now purged, he can join in the third and final festive deceiving, that of Falstaff. The conclusion is to be considered in due course, but we may anticipate a little here in order to observe that Shakespeare is manipulating the sympathies which underlie amusement, for slowly but surely we change our response from laughter at Ford as much as at Falstaff to laughter

¹This is Shakespeare's most purely comic treatment of jealousy, but still we note the obsessive circlings of thought which are so catastrophic for Othello and Leontes.

with Ford and the rest at Falstaff.¹ In other words Shakespeare combines with the main emphasis of the tradition of duped husband stories the main emphasis of Bullough's second class of gulling stories, which concern a duped lover.²

Duped lover stories derive most of their piquancy from the ludicrous discomforts of a lover whose lady punishes him for unwelcome attentions. The novelle present a splendid array of humiliations: not only grotesque hiding-places but booby-traps, exposure to the elements, mock burials and wild goose chases. Falstaff's incarceration in the buck-basket and dumping in the Thames are manifestly of the same kindred, even though his subsequent ordeals are more ingenious and purely original. But parallels can be found for the first ordeal within the duped husband type of story,³ and the second and third ordeals, though their bizarre-

¹One further story may be mentioned at this point, because it resembles MW in engineering a shift of sympathies (though it resembles the play in little else). Masuccio, Il Novellino, Story 45, tells how a student gains a lady's favours for a night by offering her all his available money; but when he approaches her again she rebuffs him because he can no longer pay. The rebuff and his penury help to induce remorse in the student. Later he happens to meet the lady's husband, and tells him the whole story without realizing his identity. But the husband realizes, and the two men go back together to the lady's house. There the husband restores the money and kills his wife for her combination of unchastity and avarice--apparently with the narrator's full approval. Here the story begins as in the other versions with sympathy for the Lover, and to some extent with the Lady, but ends in transferring approval to the Husband at the Lady's expense.

²To speak of the "main emphases" of the two traditions is not to deny that each has the other's main emphasis as a subsidiary implication; so that the Lover is somewhat ridiculous in the duped husband stories, and in the duped lover stories we often find a cuckolded husband as well.

³E.g. Lionello in Tarlton's News makes his third escape in a chest, and is carried out of danger (II.32 in Bullough's reprint of "The Two Lovers of Pisa").

ness links them more clearly with the duped lover stories,¹ have no detailed parallel with them. So far in the discussion therefore no very specific or illuminating influences from the stories to the play have emerged.

Nor do they emerge so clearly as influences from the first class of stories. Perhaps this is because the duped lover stories vary more from one another, which in turn may be because they share no such well-defined story-line and strong central situation; only the idea of somebody's discomfiture. Nevertheless they do at times show features which permit illuminating comparison with The Merry Wives and may even have influenced it. These features are best considered after a short survey of relevant versions of the duped lover situation.

Straparola's tale of Filenio Sisterno (II.2, I.66-75 in Waters' translation) has four main features of interest: Filenio pays court to three ladies simultaneously, in almost identical language; they compare notes, discover his insincerity and resolve to teach him a lesson; they submit him to three mock assassinations, from which three ordeals result; but subsequently Filenio mounts an elaborate revenge. Bandello's version (I.3) has a similar pattern of joking injury and revenge, but is less relevant to The Merry Wives since only one lady is involved. Painter in The Palace of Pleasure (1566, I.49) translates Straparola, and does so faithfully.²

¹Fortini's version is interesting here because the lover is almost as ridiculous at times as the husband, e.g. when he has to drape himself over a towel rail to escape notice (see Forsythe's article, referred to above, pp.395-396). Nevertheless he ends by enjoying the lady, so that the story belongs by its main emphasis to the duped husband group.

²See R. Pruvost, Matteo Bandello and Elizabethan Fiction, Paris, 1937, p.33 and n.1.

Of Shakespeare himself we cannot say that he used Straparola rather than Painter, or vice versa, because here again he does not follow a specific story-source but selects and modifies the stock episodes and situations of a class of story. Thus he seizes on the first feature of Straparola/Painter, the simultaneous wooings; but he improves their effect by wording Falstaff's overtures identically rather than similarly (II.i.61-73), which adds insult to injury as well as being more amusing. Again, he alters the number of ladies from three to two and shows the progress of only the one suit, to Mistress Ford: these are not improvements in themselves, but changes which assist other purposes of the play, such as the contrasting of Ford and Page. Finally Shakespeare preserves the pattern of a three-fold ordeal, though he ensures that the second ordeal eclipses the first in theatrical impact, and the third eclipses both; but he leaves out the entire second half of the inherited story, for Falstaff is to have no revenge upon the Wives at all. Here we touch on the differentia in the viewpoint and sympathies of The Merry Wives, just as we did with the duped husband stories, for although the Wives show the usual fabliau cleverness their merriment is not self-interested. Since they are free of the jealousy and lust¹ which they purge in others we do not feel that they commit hubris, nor that those others deserve to be revenged for being deceived by the Wives. The overall ethic of the play is in truth much less fabliau than the nature of its incidents would suggest. Shakespeare takes what he wants from the two

¹MWW shows the avoidance of extramarital sex which one notices in other comedies of Shakespeare (e.g. MV, TN).

types of story, so that a husband and a lover can both be duped (without any second or third lover benefitting); and he selects and heightens the female cleverness which is common to both types. But in making it the focal point of his main plot he changes its effect, from an intelligent but hard-minded pursuit of interest to a more genial, above all festive, purging of follies and final reconciliation.

Other analogues which have been drawn into discussion of The Merry Wives clearly enough belong to the basic duped lover class of story, but do not seem particularly relevant. Thus the fifth tale from Riche's Farewell to Military Profession (1581), discussed by Bullough (II.7-8), partly concerns a clever wife, who has three lovers in turn: tiring of the first two, she gets rid of them by contriving that the one shall lie in a trunk and the other shall carry it into the fields, where her third lover beats the first one and insults them both. Apart from the clever wife and the ludicrous escape inside a container, there is little similarity with our play; or even with the versions of Straparola and Painter, since the three wives and one lover have become one wife and three lovers, and there is no revenge. Nor is there more relevance in the Commedia dell' Arte scenario of Li Tre Becchi ("The Three Cuckolds"), advocated as an analogue by K.M. Lea,¹ Its plot involves the complicated evolutions by which a student courts the wife of A, who himself courts the wife of B, who in turn courts the wife of C: there are thus three cuckolds, two of whom are also

¹ Italian Popular Comedy, 2 vols., Oxford, 1934, II.432-433, and 582-584.

cuckolders. True, it includes numerous escapes from compromising situations, and especially a concealment in a wash-tub full of dirty clothes; but the main impression the scenario leaves is how much less mechanical, how much more varied, Shakespeare's main plot is. An at least equally relevant analogue might be Lyly's Woman in the Moon: here a husband, disguised as his wife, meets each of her three lovers at an assignation, and gives them a beating (IV.i). The suggestion, which as far as I know is new, would have the advantage of linking another part of The Merry Wives with Lyly (see below); but none of these suggested analogues of our play appears very close or illuminating.

The varying points of view and enlarging of sympathies are extended further by the way Shakespeare joins the discomfiture of Ford and Falstaff in the main plot with the discomfiture of Anne Page's parents in the sub-plot. (Their having a place in two plots is of course one of the unifying factors in the play). This couple, who had been unperturbed by the anxieties which beset the Fords, experience frustration in a different connection, and must in their turn be laughed out of resentment. In other words, though Shakespeare eschews the revenge conclusion to the duped lover stories he reverses roles to this extent, that he singles out Ford to reconcile the Pages with Anne and Fenton (V.v.218-220). Thus an ironic balancing is felt as the play's final effect.

The sub-plot includes much that is standard. The young lovers, who defy parental opposition and a parentally approved rival claimant to the girl's hand, are a staple item in comedy, whether romantic or intrigue in type. Shakespeare himself used such material in The Two Gentlemen, The Shrew, A Dream and Romeo and Juliet. But perhaps his interest in the situation was by now less than intense, since it is not found in its basic form after A Dream until the late romances: at this period he either leaves his protagonists independent of parental wishes, which helps to magnify their stature, or else introduces new variations, as in The Merchant, where a wise father (yet another opposite of Shylock) only seems to oppose Portia's free choice. In The Merry Wives we find a different variation. A girl's father sponsors one suitor for her hand though she herself prefers another, but in addition her mother sponsors a third suitor. Clearly the three-way conflict lends itself to intrigue rather than to romance treatment and was surely included for that purpose. Clearly too Shakespeare could have invented such a conflict, yet he may actually have been using a well-established literary model--the Casina of Plautus, or perhaps some intermediary modelled on that play.

In the Casina a girl is wooed by three suitors; a man and his wife support different suitors; but the third suitor (their son) outwits the other suitors and their sponsors, and wins the girl. Of course The Merry Wives lacks certain features of Roman New Comedy, such as the girl's slave status, and the fact that neither the son nor his father, who is also in pursuit, is interested in marrying

her; and there is a further difference of situation because the parents who disagree about suitors are now the girl's; but R.S. Forsythe¹ may be right in urging that the story of Anne Page derives ultimately from the Casina, although there are also more general similarities with Dekker's Shoemaker's Holiday (1599) and its source in Deloney, as Bullough points out (II.10-11). But when Forsythe argues that the play supplied other motifs for The Merry Wives, he is on even shakier ground. The most plausible of his too numerous suggestions are these: the duping of a lecherous old man (p.408); the fact that his plans are betrayed to those who stand to lose by their success (pp.407, 413); his being beaten (p.417); and the deception of a man who discovers that his so-called bride is not a woman (pp.406, 413 f.). The first three suggestions all require us to accept that Shakespeare might transfer motifs from the source of his sub-plot to his main plot, but the motifs are common enough in Renaissance comedy, as well as in novelle, for the hypothesis to be unnecessary. It is probably a mistake to try to discern motifs common to the main plot of The Merry Wives and the source of its sub-plot; for though the two plots are developed concurrently, they seldom interact.

The main point in the action where there is recognizable interaction, and ironic juxtaposition, between the two plots is at their common conclusion in Windsor forest; and here the fourth

¹"A Plautine Source of MWW", M.Phil., XVIII, 1920, pp.401-421.

suggestion I have drawn from Forsythe may be of value, since it involves no such hypothesis of transference as the first three. Disguise in the conclusion is almost universal: Falstaff as Herne the Hunter, and the rest of the company as fairies, are in disguise as well as the two boy-brides. So the Casina may be the source of the final disguise, the piece de resistance, by which the main plot deceivers are themselves deceived.

Nevertheless the question whether or not there is a specific debt to Plautus in the conclusion is subordinate to an adequate recognition of the dazzling combination of sources here. Not merely are the main plot and sub-plot brought to a satisfying conclusion in broad accordance with duped lover stories and with the three-way wooing situation respectively, but the winding-up is achieved by drawing on new sources, which appear to have little connection with each other, let alone with the sources reviewed so far. These new sources are thought¹ to include (A) Ovid's Metamorphoses (III.138-252) for the idea of Actaeon and other material from classical mythology; (B) native folklore, possibly, for Herne the Hunter and other folk beliefs; (C) Shakespeare's own Dream, for the fairies and the placing among them of a gross, metamorphosed mortal; (D) Lyly's Endimion (IV.iii) for the pinching by fairies; and (E) topical instigation for the fairies' references to the Garter (V.v.53-71). If one were to speculate in what order these very diverse elements occurred to Shakespeare, different answers would be possible: my own tentative ordering would be as above, but Bullough's (II.17) is CBAD. It is however more practicable to show, logically rather than

¹Cf. Bullough, II.16-18, and Cap.1 above.

"genetically", how the selection and adaptation of these particular materials complete the structural and thematic movements which source-analysis has revealed in the rest of the play; and for this purpose my order seems at any rate convenient.

(A) The story of Actaeon, the huntsman changed to an antlered deer, gave rise to a name for a cuckold,¹ so that earlier in the play Shakespeare added this to the horn jokes which were endemic to his main plot materials. But whereas those references to Actaeon were spoken about Ford or by him, Shakespeare now at the conclusion expands the joke and transfers it to the lover, engineering a gradual revelation that the roles have been reversed; the horns which Falstaff, as Herne the Hunter, wears are not the emblems of a mighty hunter/lover, but of the hunter hunted, of man pursued to disaster by his own desires. Such is the accepted Renaissance moral of the Actaeon story, as found in the emblem books of Alciati and Whitney and echoed by Shakespeare himself in Twelfth Night:

That instant was I turn'd into a hart,
And my desires, like fell and cruel hounds,
E'er since pursue me. (I.i.21-23)

Accordingly what probably began as a mere cuckoldry joke is extended into a brilliant symbol of poetic justice, particularly effective on the stage.

Association with the Actaeon myth led to a further borrowing from Ovid, namely Falstaff's comparison of his own metamorphosis to

¹ II.i.106, III.ii.35-36; and see H.C. Hart, ed. Arden MW, II.i.119 n.

those of Jupiter--into a bull to woo Europa and into a swan to woo Leda (V.v.2-14). The use to which Shakespeare puts the myths, though not particularly profound, is effective. Falstaff is both boasting of the example of classical divinity and hiding behind it; but emblematically the disguise of man as a beast could scarcely justify either complacency or excuse. It is the shrewd placing of Ovidian material here which makes its use ironically expressive as well as witty, for the character's self-image is drawn from the same body of inherited wisdom which, on the wider view, provides the precedent for his condemnation.

(B) A kindred deftness of selection is found in the way Shakespeare couples his Actaeon with Herne the Hunter. The origins and significance of this story are obscure, and it is not even certain that Shakespeare did not originate the legend. But all that concerns us here is to note that the antler head-dress of Herne (whose name is even spelled "Horne" by the Quarto at IV.iv.27 and elsewhere) provides the perfect English complement, local to Windsor itself, to the horns of the classical Actaeon. As a result Shakespeare evokes the same sort of pleasing, intangibly ordered gallimaufry of classical and native, literary, folklore and topical elements which can be found in Elizabethan pageant and masque as a whole; but specifically in the works of Spenser and Lyly; and last but not least in Shakespeare's own comedies, especially Love's Labour's Lost and A Dream.

(C) The fairies have a similar underlying blend of elements, but their immediate source is simply A Dream. Fairy elements which recur include, besides the fairies themselves, "ouphees" or changelings

(IV.iv.48); fairy revels, songs and dances (53-61, etc.); a queen of the fairies (69); and Hobgoblin, or the Puck (V.v.34, S.D.). Their effect, however, is radically different, since their function is different. As opposed to the fairies of A Dream these fairies do not point beyond themselves: they create sufficient belief in Falstaff for his punishment and purging to be carried through (though even he detects the Welshness of one fairy, V.v.79), but there is nothing like the earlier attempt to gain suspension of disbelief from the audience. Human agencies, not the supernatural or psychological, are in full control, and we know it. Consequently the lines are cruder,¹ almost (as Bullough observes, II.17) self-parodic; but that is appropriate since the very absurdity of these fairies will help to make their dupe ridiculous, as also does the greater emphasis on their grotesquerie, and mild diabolism; for there are now apparently two fairy queens, one of them being Mistress Quickly,² who can scarcely rival Titania's tinsel grace; and two figures of darker magic, not only Pistol as the Puck (V.v.34, S.D.) but Sir Hugh Evans as a "devil" (V.iii.12), or rather a satyr (see Quarto S.D. at V.v.34). These rollicking fairies exactly suit the man-controlled atmosphere of intrigue and festive gulling which has prevailed in the play heretofore.

In only one respect is there some reversal of the movement of the fairies away from the elusive wonder of "dreaming" in the

¹There is more verse hereabouts in MW than earlier, but instead of the evocative delicacy of the fairy verse in MND its incantations have an earthy, joggrot quality: "But, stay. I smell a man of middle earth" (V.v.78), which is almost like the "Fee-fi-fo-fum" of the nursery rhyme.

²The matter is obscure. See Arden edn., V.v.41, n.

earlier play. The woodland and night-time setting, into which the action of A Dream moves for its resolution but which it then relinquishes, again resolves the wooing entanglements; but it does so almost more climactically since it is found at the very end of the play, and only there, and as it were remains in possession at the close. The delighted wonder with which, in the theatre especially, we witness the forest disguisings is not unlike the wonder which is characteristic of romance, even though Anne's elopement, like every stage of her story, depends predominantly on intrigue. Consequently although the use of setting will owe something perhaps to A Dream, at whose conclusion the fairies take over the palace, the new placing of the woodland resolutions is surely exquisite, a master-touch in which repetition is at the service of originality.

(D) and (E) It is however interesting that while the fairies owe a good deal, both generally and specifically, to A Dream there is also a specific borrowing from Lyly in this part of the play, where the fairies' pinching of Corsites because he (like Actaeon) has seen forbidden sights (IV.iii.30-32, 38) becomes¹ the Windsor fairies' pinching of Falstaff for lecherous thoughts (V.v.88 ff.--another sort of prying). This is one of surprisingly few specific borrowings from Lyly in Shakespearean comedy. It is the more interesting because it coincides with one of Shakespeare's equally rare excursions into topical reference, in the fairies' gracious blessing of Windsor Castle

¹Even if folk beliefs also influenced Shakespeare in this matter, the literary influence should be admitted as a joint source.

and celebration of the Order of the Garter (V.v.53-71). Though no theory regarding the particular occasion for which this reference was written has won general acceptance, we can reasonably assume that it was devised as a compliment to a court audience, probably at Windsor itself. Outside The Merry Wives Shakespearean comedy differed markedly from Lyly's court comedies in not implying that the world of the courtly audience and of the monarch who presided over it had greater reality than the world inhabited by the characters of the play;¹ conversely in this comedy, where he moves closer to Lyly's attitude for a time, we find it alongside a specific borrowing from Endimion. The unusual co-presence of two Lylyan features reminds us of other features, which cannot be ascribed to Lyly in particular since they were the general currency of Elizabethan masque and pageant, but are nevertheless extremely characteristic of his work: the free use of song and dance, the blending of mythological with native story and character, the juxtaposition of diverse moods.

Yet a recognition that Lyly's example and influence may be as potent in this comedy of Shakespeare as in his others must not occlude a more important influence, that of Shakespeare's own earlier work. This has been acknowledged as regards the fairies and setting of A Dream, but of course the element of self-borrowing goes beyond them. In fact, whatever we make of Rowe's statement (1709) that the

¹See G.K. Hunter, John Lyly, pp.307-310, for the contrast, epitomized in the way final metamorphosis disappears in favour of internal character-change.

Queen bade Shakespeare compose a comedy on the subject of Falstaff in love, the play is more obviously a revival than any other play (if we exclude the histories). The revival is not a repetition of incidents, which come exclusively from the story-traditions if they are not topical or invented, but is rather a transference of characters from the sub-plot of the Henry IV plays: Falstaff, Shallow, Bardolph, Pistol, Nym, the page and Mistress Quickly.¹ So much is announced by the recurrent names and functions.² But how far does recurrence extend? Shallow and the three followers of Falstaff certainly appear to be transplants, since their names, characters and functions are much the same in the comedy as in Henry IV. The page too has the same function and character, although he is now given the name Robin. Of Mistress Quickly however H.C. Hart declared that she "has nothing in common with 'Mrs. Quickly' of the historical plays except the name" (Arden Introduction, p.lxi). The judgment is perhaps extreme since the character of this lady is as cheerfully vulgar and morally easy as before; but certainly her function has altered, from that of a hostess rooted in Eastcheap to the unrooted housekeeper of Dr. Caius and go-between in all the love-suits of the play. Perhaps she lost her usefulness as a hostess because The Merry Wives was to have a merry host, with his own sub-plot, but her complaisant

¹ Because all these characters occur in 2HIV but some of them die or change status in HV, the events of MW must be supposed to occur between 2HIV and HV; but that is not the same as saying that MW itself was composed between the two histories.

² More generally Evans and Dr. Caius may have been prompted by the success of the Welsh characters in 1HIV and HV, and of the French characters in HV.

morals and free-running malapropisms made her a natural and vivacious go-between. Some such character was permitted, though not necessitated, by the gulling stories Shakespeare was using and more generally by the patterns of Italian intrigue comedy; consequently she is a dexterous amalgamation of a name and character repeated from Henry IV with a dramatic function which belongs to intrigue comedy.

If the role of Mistress Quickly can be best understood by reference to her sources, in Henry IV but not only there, we can understand the Falstaff of our play from a similar perspective. It has troubled many interpreters that although this Falstaff shows continuity with his namesake in Henry IV in many things--age, girth, appetites, morals, company, flamboyant prose--he now lacks the wit to suspect a conspiracy against himself, even when he has just experienced the effects of prior conspiracies, and--more damningly still--that he lacks the wit to extricate himself, as he had done so brilliantly in Henry IV. But the deficiencies in this Falstaff's intelligence are just what we found in the behaviour of many of his prototypes in the duped lover stories: in other words his behaviour is determined by his situation, which is taken from the story-tradition and the general contours of intrigue. He does not depend upon his namesake in Henry IV for all his characteristics though he does for many, any more than he borrows all the characteristics of the duped lovers. In fact he demonstrates particularly well a tendency noticed in other features of the composition of The Merry Wives:

he is a combination, of remarkably diverse elements, and the nature and balancing of the combined elements depend upon the specific purposes of the play. These, though they draw on existing literary works and established genres, are not to be confined by them: instead the play finely selects, dexterously redeploys, and creates its own decorum.¹

The same qualities strike us if we turn from this play to As You Like It--just because the latter play, though it is of the same period, is so radically different. Instead of a stock situation owed to no specific literary source and not closely paralleled even by a story-tradition, we find a main plot owed directly to a single literary predecessor. Instead of sub-plots drawn from further literary traditions we find that the sub-plots too come from the main story-source. Instead of a few, major debts to Shakespeare's own earlier work we find many, but much less specific, recurrences. Instead of the rapid story-movement and clear-cut situations of an intrigue comedy we find the leisurely intertwining story-line and antithetical ironies of pastoral romance. Even the fact that The Merry Wives acquires some pastoral colouring at its close does not mute the contrast, for the resonance of pastoral is circumscribed--positively, because intrigue continues preponderant to the very last line (Ford's joke about "Master Brook" sleeping with Mistress Ford tonight); and negatively, because pastoral in the changed setting begins to arouse wonder but brings with it no other features of romance. To see how far pastoral and romance can bring out each other's significance one must turn to As You Like It.

¹The same eclecticism in Shakespeare's employment of intrigue models can be seen in his exploitation of contemporary "humours" comedy, for local effects in the part of Nym (cf. Bullough, II.11).

CHAPTER NINE

AS YOU LIKE IT: PASTORAL ROMANCE

Since As You Like It follows Thomas Lodge's Rosalynde¹ so closely it will be harder than usual to distinguish what is owed to the main story-source from the dependence of both works upon their genre, the pastoral romance; and there is the further difficulty that while some elements clearly belong to romance and others to pastoral, the two overlap a good deal. Our discussion will have most to say about the use of Rosalynde of course, but it will be useful to establish generic perspectives at the outset. As for the relations of pastoral and romance, it is most convenient to consider apropos of romance those elements which were analysed in Chapter Two; and then to consider such variations of, or additions to, these elements as are occasioned by the unprecedented emphasis which Shakespeare gives in this play to pastoral romance--without attempting to distinguish absolutely between pastoral and romance.

Adventures, marvels, love and sens are present in both novel and play; and in forms characteristic of mature sixteenth century romance, since love not only predominates but controls the treatment of other elements. The story includes such straightforward adventures as the escape from oppression of the hero and the heroine, and in the case of Orlando's wrestling and his rescue of Oliver from wild beasts adventures require physical as well as moral courage. Nevertheless, in spite of these primitive romance

¹The text used is the edn. of 1590, as reprinted by Bullough, II.158-256.

traits, the most important adventure is always the wooing of Rosalind and Orlando, which begins before they escape and occupies most of their time when they have escaped. The main effect of Orlando's physical prowess is to establish him as a worthy lover. Similarly with the use of setting, of which more must be said concerning pastoral and the story-source than here concerning romance: the forest provides a test of the hero's worth, in terms of courage and courtesy, as the choice of caskets does in The Merchant or the sea in Twelfth Night. The effect of setting however is often emotional rather than ethical, when it evokes wonder in itself or accommodates wonderful events like the chain of coincidences which brings the characters together in Arden. Marvels generally assist the course of love in this play, just as love too concludes its self-definition in wonder: for example in the one case it is by "conjuring" that Rosalind stage-manages the final multiple wedding, and in the other case Hymen speaks of "wonder" and the Duke closes the action by speaking of "true delights" (V.iv.133, 192). The serious interests of romance, notably the presentation and analysis of the idealized behaviour of high-born youths and maidens, are also oriented towards their experiences of love, so that although it is not the hero's purpose in repaying old Adam's loyalty to prove himself worthy of the heroine's love, that is again the main effect. As for the preeminence of love within the whole romance we need only

reflect how much time is devoted to the progress of Lodge's three, or Shakespeare's four, love-relationships.¹

Smaller romance features are also used freely by both authors. The most obvious examples are the love at first sight which the brothers feel for their ladies, and the ladies for them, and the conventional impenetrability of the heroine's disguise. Among less obvious aspects is the unrealistic setting, in which an ostensibly French forest harbours lions and palm-trees alongside oaks and icicles: Arden owes a good deal to the "mixed forest" of romance tradition, which goes back through medieval to classical Latin literature.² Another convention which has caused misunderstanding is that by which the repentance of a bad man, however late or sudden, is to be accepted as genuine and irrevocable. So it is with Saladyne's and Oliver's, where interestingly we find that Shakespeare leans more heavily upon

¹Correspondences of Character. For convenience of exposition here are the main parallels of character between the novel and As You Like It.

<u>Rosalynde</u>	<u>As You Like It</u>
Adam Spencer, an English man	Adam
Alinda (alias Aliena)	Celia (alias Aliena)
The Norman	Charles
Coridon	Corin
King Torismond	Duke Frederick
King Gerismond	Duke (Senior)
Fernandyne of Bourdeaux	Jaques de Boys
Saladyne " "	Oliver " "
Rosader " "	Orlando " "
Phoebe	Phebe
Rosalynde (alias Ganymede)	Rosalind (alias Ganymede)
Montanus	Silvius

Names are referred to by these spellings, since they serve to distinguish "Rosalynde" from "Rosalind", "Ganimede" from "Ganymede" and "Phoebe" from "Phebe".

²See E.R. Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, tr. W.R. Trask, New York, 1953, Cap.10.

the convention than Lodge does--Oliver's repentance being the more swift because the dramatist must compress his narration more than the novelist needs to. Later however Shakespeare employs the same convention even more boldly, when the usurping Duke, about to give battle to the rightful Duke,

...meeting with an old religious man,
After some question with him, was converted
Both from his enterprise and from the world...
(V.iv.154-156)

The need for dramatic compression is evident in the very syntax, the syllepsis carrying a great deal of the weight. This repentance however, which is not in Lodge, has another effect, because instead of a final battle in which Alinda's father is killed Shakespeare's action consistently avoids deaths.¹ Part of the reason for such avoidance is that deaths conflict with the mood of comedy, or romance as Shakespeare usually conceived it, and especially so in a play which is "as you like it". But a more interesting reason concerns the nature of causality in romance, and leads us from romance towards pastoral romance.

In tragedy as in life some acts (or failures to act) are irrevocable, death being the most obvious. Insofar as fortune has any part in the outcome it is inexorable. Comedy however tends not only to avoid emphasis on mortality and actual deaths but--especially in romantic comedy--to stand against death. Though in extreme cases comedy even turns death into some form of resurrection (as we saw in connection with Much Ado), it is more usual to find that death, however imminent, is somehow averted; yet the result psychologically,

¹ Similarly, in Rosalynde the Franklin's sons are killed by the wrestler, but in AYL I.ii the old man's sons are perhaps not slain.

on the characters and the audience, is still akin to resurrection. Fortune in this context is at least as operative as in tragedy, but to an opposite effect, for instead of leading the great to delusion and a final downfall fortune is more divine than sub-human—a benign agent of the supernatural, as was argued in Chapter Two, rather than a whimsical, heartless courtesan. Along with these two conceptions of fortune there tend to go two views of Time, which tends to be either the enemy of mankind, who sooner or later brings down the eminent to disgrace and death, or the tester and ultimate healer.¹ In the one case Time is rectilinear, remorseless and more than a little deterministic: on the other Time is cyclic, kindly and responsive to repentance. The contrast may be expressed in the formula that whereas tragedy is partly the domain of chance, romantic comedy is partly the domain of the second chance;² and this is surely what prompts Shakespeare to make not only the hero's brother repent (as in Rosalynde), but the usurping Duke and (more equivocally) his invented cynic, Jaques. Though the touch is light, even perfunctory, it is sure and in accord with the underlying meaning of his generic materials.

Of this we can be the more certain because those materials include pastoral, whose rural setting naturally connotes the abundant replenishing of life by the cycle of the seasons; and what is

¹As in other respects the latent metaphysic of romantic comedy is clearest in WT, where Time is even allowed to speak as chorus on his own behalf.

²Cf. M. Lascelles, "Shakespeare's Pastoral Comedy", in More Talking of Shakespeare, ed. J. Garrett, 1959, p.75.

repentance but the traditional prelude to a renewal of life? (Yet again The Winter's Tale illuminates, for there the generation-long repentance of Leontes at last wins him renewal).

Pastoral however has its own metaphysical basis, which must be examined in order to establish the idiosyncratic generic resonances of As You Like It and to plot its use of particular pastoral materials. Though a good deal has been written about the philosophical bases of pastoral, I think the essence of what Shakespeare uses can be stated quite briefly. At its most obvious level pastoral represents and celebrates country life as it is conceived of by the courtly and sophisticated: the essence of that life is its simplicity and leisure, the absence of that complexity and frenzied activity which characterize the opposing world of court and city. By its very nature pastoral involves antithesis and ambivalence: antithesis because rival ways of life, or conceptions of value, are implicitly or explicitly contrasted; and ambivalence because the simple life is celebrated, often in remarkably highly-wrought (not to say artificial) language, by those who do not know that life at first hand. The broad antithesis of city and country therefore lends itself to the elucidation of many related antitheses in a spirit which is also usually ambivalent, whether the causes of ambivalence are being treated playfully, ironically or seriously. If we consider these antitheses and moods, it will become clearer at how many points As You Like It has drawn sustenance from pastoral meanings and forms.

The first antithesis is between the subservience of men at court to the favour of fortune and princes, and the self-reliant contentment of the countryman—the difference between Shakespeare's two dukes, or between Le Beau and Corin. A related antithesis would be that which was discussed earlier, between fickle and benign fortune, the worlds requiring in humans stoical endurance and trusting patience respectively. Constraint too is opposed to freedom; time hustling its subjects along to death is opposed to the timelessness of leisure in which (since it is assumed that the tending of sheep involves little or no actual work) death and the thought of death may recede from the forefront of consciousness; anxiety opposed to contentment; malice and suspicion opposed to love and security—in short the bad and the real opposed to the good and the ideal. All these oppositions may be found in As You Like It, but perhaps it is sufficient to instance the awkwardness of the love-overtures of Rosalind and Orlando at court (on which both comment) with the delightful unconstraint they experience in Arden.

Every one of these antitheses however is also made ambivalent in the play, as in other pastorals. Love, as one might expect of those who are both leisured and contented, is the primary avocation of pastoral characters, but not necessarily happy love: love indeed is the exception that proves the rule, since it may bring ill fortune, loss of liberty, anxiety and despair, even to the inhabitants of Arcadia. Yet not only the lovelorn Silvius

and Orlando experience ill fortune in Arden, but even the spokesman of rural stoicism himself, Corin (II.iv.70-86). Hunger and danger are not eliminated from this forest, any more than winter, although it is true that relief and succour are more likely to be forthcoming than at the court. That Shakespeare has followed robust rather than languid patterns for his pastoral society is clear from two more features of Arden: its hunting and its sense of time. Hunting seems to be emphasized in preference to the sheep-tending stereotype of pastoral employment, probably because it is a more vigorous, pageant-filled, kingly pursuit (compare Navarre and Theseus). Similarly Time is notable for its lack of pressure upon the characters of pastoral, for "there's no clock in the forest" (III.ii.284), and yet death does come, even for them: that death is found even in the pastoral world is recognized by several characters in the play.¹ In doing so they as it were lift their heads from the timeless present and afford us a glimpse of Time's other possibilities—which can seem all the more sombre when at last they do break in. Ambivalence goes even further, for these characters are not all equally reliable witnesses of Time. Jaques' setpiece on the Seven Ages is marked by a vitiating *schadenfreude* (II.vii.139 ff., cf. 43-69), and Touchstone's perception of riping and rotting (II.vii.16-34) so empties life, including his own life, of all meaning that it may be meant to delude Jaques rather than to be

¹ Memento mori as a normal feature of pastorals is discussed by E. Panofsky, "Et in Arcadia Ego. On the Conception of Transience in Poussin and Watteau", in Philosophy and History. Essays Presented to Ernst Cassirer, ed. R. Klibansky and H.J. Paton, Oxford, 1936, pp.223-254.

taken seriously. The final ambivalence that needs to be noted is implicit in the others: it is not true after all that the pastoral life is totally good and ideal, nor that other forms of life are totally depraved. Goodness and reality are so much more mixed that Arden contains evils, and courtliness contains some good; in fact, since the exiles all return to court in the end the only conclusion seems to be that country and court have each their own excellence as forms of society, and the people who are truly to be pitied are those who cannot live as free individuals in either society.¹

If pastoral carries meanings like these, then its suitability to romance and comedy should be considerable, and at two points particularly--its inclusiveness and its underlying seriousness, the two being closely connected. The inclusiveness is seen first in the capacity of the form to accommodate various levels of speech; for while the difference between the styles of Audrey and Silvius is Shakespeare's own contrivance, pastoral had traditionally included verse and song as well as prose (see for instance Piana and Sidney's Arcadia, as well as Rosalynde itself). Inclusiveness is however more potent in terms of content. In general of course it is plain that a wide range of character-types are already present in Lodge's novel, and that Shakespeare has extended this range further. But the extensions have a peculiar force when they draw on pastoral precedents, as when Corin and Touchstone debate their merits of country and court life (III.ii.11-77). Their exchange

¹Even so the outlook appears less bleak for Duke Frederick and Jaques than for Shylock, Don John and Malvolio because the former are less self-isolating.

stands in a long line of such debates, which usually ended in the "putting down" of the city sophisticate¹ and the vindication of "otium" against "negotium". Shakespeare continues the tradition in that Corin answers the Fool's nimble nonsense with dignity and some weight of self-knowledge; but he modifies it in that elsewhere the Fool's strictures on the sheer inconvenience of country life (II.iv.1-15) carry weight, and that our total response to the exchange is not simply in Corin's favour. We certainly approve his wisdom, but we also applaud the Fool's perverse dexterity; and delight the more in both because they are as far apart in style as in attitude. Since both are putting on a good show, our delight assists understanding and acceptance of both viewpoints. As in this exchange so in the play as a whole partisanship gives way to a larger understanding, and to the tolerance which is perhaps a wisdom larger than the commonplaces of the simple life.

The same wisdom emerges if instead of considering how the inclusiveness of pastoral can be serious one considers how its serious concerns are inclusive. Time may be our example. Shakespeare conveys that tranquillity which achieves some independence of time in Corin, and also in the conventional intensity of shepherd-love which makes it natural for Silvius to ignore time; but he ingeniously modifies it by the more spontaneous intensity of Rosalind. Yet he does not exempt her from extremes of impatience, precisely over Orlando's unpunctuality. So pastoral timelessness involves

¹Cf. Costard and Boyet, LLL IV.i.122-142.

time after all, and there are more direct allusions to the power of time over man, as we have already argued. Yet the freedom and gaiety which pastoral, its disguises and its timelessness, make possible in the characters who are conscious of time vindicate the ability to ignore time. What else does pastoral--and comedy--do for its audiences but release them for a time from the pressure of time? Time-perspectives and timeless abandon are seen to be equally human, necessary and serious.

Within this framework of ideas Shakespeare reflects also a substantial number of formal and material aspects of pastoral romance which may briefly be enumerated. The plotting of pastoral romance tends to be multiple and complex, and Shakespeare will have found both aspects congenial; not however equally, since after A Dream he seems less absorbed in the sheer complication of love-entanglement. Accordingly he does not add to Lodge's complications, but extends him rather by increasing the multiplicity of characters and stories (Touchstone, Audrey, William and Jaques). The meeting and debating of characters who exist in stylized antithesis to one another is more pronouncedly extended by Shakespeare, for as well as the encounter of Corin and Touchstone which has been discussed we find the debate of young and old, lover and non-lover in the exchanges of Silvius and Corin (II.iv), and also in the less equable exchanges of Orlando and Rosalind with Jaques (III.ii, IV.i). Whereas these are all encounters of pastoral characters with one another, or of those who can accept the pastoral world, albeit.

temporarily, with Jaques who cannot, Shakespeare goes further to include also the meeting of two outsiders, Jaques and Touchstone (II.vii, III.iii).¹ So far does pastoral prompt him that he improvises antitheses of his own until the play becomes not only his "enquiry into pastoral" but his farthest venture in comic juxtapositioning.² Nearly all the accepted forms of pastoral lyric, as Hallett Smith lists them, are reflected in Shakespeare's play: "complaints, invitations, palinodes, love dialogues, blazons and dance songs".³ Complaints are twice given to Silvius (II.iv, III.v): elegant complaint is his only tone of voice, a fact which Shakespeare uses to imply a criticism of pastoral itself. Invitation is employed in a more novel, less generic way since we find not the invitation of a lover ("Come live with me and be my love") but a celebration in song of the country life by one who is not in love (Amiens, "Under the greenwood tree", II.v). Palinode, the song in rejection of love, is similarly transformed, into the repeated sour grapes of Jaques who does not love because he cannot. Love dialogues abound, whether formal as that of Silvius and Phebe or informal as of

¹See further E. Greenlaw, "Shakespeare's Pastorals", originally published in *SP*, XIII, 1916, pp.122-154, but referred to here in the abridged reprint of E.T. Lincoln (ed.), *Pastoral and Romance. Modern Essays in Criticism*, New York, 1969, pp.83-101. Greenlaw argues (pp.87 ff.) that Jaques is a counterpart to Colin in Spenser, *Fa* VI, and Philisides in the *Arcadia*; an "extra shepherd, melancholy, having no part in the main action yet deeply significant as one of the pastoral *dramatis personae*" (pp.88-89). So much may be true, but Greenlaw's implication that as Colin stands for Spenser himself and Philisides for Sidney so Jaques is a surrogate for Shakespeare can be rejected.

²Cf. esp. H. Jenkins, "As You Like It" in *Shakespeare Survey*, VIII, 1955, pp.40-51.

³*Elizabethan Poetry. A Study in Conventions, Meaning and Expression*, Cambridge, Mass., 1952, p.19.

Rosalind and Orlando, or a virtuoso combination of both as in the litany of love which Rosalind deflates (V.ii.77-115). Orlando's verses to Rosalind are blazons, or catalogues of his lady's beauties: here too the character who is obedient to generic convention is mocked for his pains, as the punctiliously Petrarchan lover usually is in Shakespearean comedy. At the same time Orlando's verses become progressively more adequate as blazons until his latest is in fact an exquisite example of its kind. Dance songs as such are not present in As You Like It, though songs of course abound; but their spirit is found, generalized into songs of good life and love songs, and into the free gaiety of open air life and the heroine's energetic enjoyment of her disguise role. Indeed in a sense all pastoral is a disguising, even a masque; by a paradox the character who is explicitly playing a disguise role, Rosalind, is the most aware that pastoral involves make-believe. By seeing also the need for it, she becomes the best, because freest, exponent of its festive and releasing capacity.

In the last analysis however Shakespeare's indebtedness to pastoral forms must be modified by a continual sense that he has put them to new uses, and that in combination they comprise a view of life a good deal larger than pastoral normally achieved. One reason is that the pastoral elements are so articulated by juxtaposition as to comment on one another and on their generic source.

Another reason is that Shakespeare's additions of extra-pastoral reality enhance this effect. In addition certain semi-pastoral elements complement, and give solidity to, traditional pastoral: Robin Hood materials (to be discussed in a moment) and the English festive tradition (quintessentially in the song "It was a lover and his lass"), Further evidence that Shakespeare's treatment of Lodge involved penetration to a deep and wide-ranging conception of pastoral life may perhaps be found in the fact that whereas Lodge had used English materials but disguised them in the forms of European pastoral romance Shakespeare instinctively perceived both derivations of Lodge's story. So much will be seen as we consider the story-tradition.

Rosalynde is based on the pseudo-Chaucerian Tale of Gamelyn.¹ Yet although Gamelyn's adventures are like Rosader's so much else has been added that some scholars think Lodge did not use Gamelyn (which existed only in manuscript in his day) but rather some work or works which combined the adventures with the love matters and perhaps the pastoral.² It is unwise however to replace one uncertainty, Lodge's access to manuscript, by another, the putative intermediary, and unnecessary to deny Lodge the originality of changing the mood and the implicit values. Be this as it may the originality is certainly considerable, because Rosalynde is further from Gamelyn than As You Like It from the novel.

¹Bullough, II.143; the most conclusive detail is the recurrence of "Adam spenser" (Adam the Steward) as "Adam Spencer an English man" in Lodge (II.173).

²Cf. C.S. Lewis, English Literature in the Sixteenth Century Excluding Drama, Oxford, 1954, p.423; for the opposite view cf. W.W. Greg, ed. Lodge's Rosalynde (Shakespeare Classics series), 1907, Introdn., pp.xvii-xix.

Gamelyn¹ is a rousing tale of oppression and just revenge, with plenty of fighting and not a few deaths. When Gamelyn's eldest brother Iohan tries to deprive him of his inheritance, Gamelyn asserts himself (with a pestle). There is a false reconciliation between them, and as Gamelyn goes off to a wrestling match, Iohan prays that he may get his neck broken. Nevertheless he returns victorious to find himself shut out, whereupon he bursts in and throws the porter down a well. Another false reconciliation with Iohan follows, and he is tricked into letting himself be bound. Adam the Spencer releases him, and together they win a battle royal with the brother and the greedy churchmen who are his cronies. The Sheriff arrives with reinforcements, so Gamelyn and Adam take to the woods, where they meet a group of outlaws and Gamelyn is made their king. Iohan has now become Sheriff and proclaims Gamelyn outlaw. After further incidents Gamelyn comes with his men to free the second brother, Sir Ote, who has spoken up for him, and they hang Iohan along with other villains. At the very end of the tale he marries "a wyfe bothe good and feyr" (line 898).

There are several affinities with tales of Robin Hood. The wicked elder and virtuous younger brothers are found in folktale at large while the oppressive Sheriff, the greedy landowning clergy, and the greenwood life of outlaws who are generous to the poor (lines 780 -782) are the familiar essence of Robin Hood tales. Since Gamelyn

¹ Referred to in the edn. of W.W. Skeat, Oxford, 1893.

dates from c.1325-50, before the Robin Hood ballad cycle as it survives, it may be an early phase in the formation of the cycle, as suggested by M. Lascelles (in More Talking of Shakespeare, p.78). In the ballad versions which resemble the lay, such as "A Gest of Robyn Hode",¹ a knight falls foul of the clergy and loses his lands until Robin and his men help him to regain them. The ballad tradition softens the story, for the dispossessed knight is gently disconsolate rather than violently retributive, and the outlaws restore him by the show of force rather than by violence and executions (Lascelles, p.79). Other echoes of Gamelyn in the ballads include Child No.128, "Robin Hood Newly Revived", where Robin is met and challenged by a bold young man called Gamwell, who has killed his father's steward and fled to the greenwood. Of this ballad Child says, "The story seems to have been built up on a portion of the ruins, so to speak, of the fine tale of Gamelyn" (III.144). Another ballad is called "Robyn and Gandeleyne" (No.115, III.12), where the last name recalls both "Gamelyn" and the insulting pun "gadelyng" which Iohan in the lay flings at his younger brother (line 102). It is probably true that the story of Gamelyn, dismembered to supply elements for the ballads, has lost more than it has gained by being absorbed into the mass of material, of variable quality, linked with Robin.

Lodge keeps on the whole to the lay and its more vigorous action: he includes many fights, several deaths and a final battle,

¹ F.J. Child, The English and Scottish Popular Ballads, Boston, Mass., 1882-98, 5 vols., reissued in 3 vols., New York, 1957. Reference is to the original vol. III, (i.e. vol.II of the reissue), No. 117.

and the early parts of the novel share the lay's interest in justice.¹ On the other hand he may owe something to the Robin Hood tradition as well, for as M.C. Bradbrook² remarks, "There is a good deal of Robin Hood's ingenuity in fighting and defiance of the law in the early part of Lodge's *Rosalynde*, and Adam Spencer as he is there presented is almost like the Adam of the old ballad, a stout man at his weapon." Furthermore Adam Spencer is "an English man" and the cruel wrestler a Norman—a contrast which reflects, even in a French setting, the allegiances of the folk tradition. Yet although tradition and lay may both have influenced Lodge he avoids overt reference to either, perhaps because, his purpose being to make well-bred pastoral romance from the popular folk lay, he wanted a pattern of events to work up rather than a style, a milieu or values. Shakespeare, however, unlike Lodge, names Robin Hood at the first opportunity:

<u>Oliver:</u>	Where will the old Duke live?
<u>Charles:</u>	They say he is already in the Forest of Arden, and a many merry men with him; and there they live like the old Robin Hood of England. They say many young gentlemen flock to him every day, and fleet the time carelessly, as they did in the golden world. (I.i.104-109)

As a result we can expect that the Duke will have affinities with English as well as classical pastoral myth; later on, in scenes which Shakespeare added to Lodge, we see that the outlaws' life involves hunting, its pleasures and rites, and Folio stage directions such as "like foresters" (II.i, HN) or "like outlaws" (II.vii.HN)

¹ Perhaps because Lodge had a grievance against his own elder brother—a factor which may first have drawn him to *Gamelyn* (cf. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century*, pp.423-424).

² *Shakespeare and Elizabethan Poetry*, p.246, n.16.

suggest that they wear green hunting-costume. Elizabethans must therefore have been reminded at several points of their national folk-hero, who was currently enjoying a vogue in the plays of Chettle and Munday about "Robert Earl of Huntingdon".¹ So although the debt to pastoral is more structural and pervasive Shakespeare has added colouring and spectacle from "an idyllic folk tradition which was the popular equivalent of the courtly pastoral".²

In taking over the story-pattern of Gamelyn Lodge made several changes which were of the greatest use to Shakespeare after him. The most important is reflected in the new title--"Rosalynde", not "Rosader"--for Lodge has moved the wife mentioned at the end of the lay as one of Gamelyn's rewards into the centre of the novel. Since her relationships (not only with Rosader) in fact are its centre, it is clear that Shakespeare's source has already brought the heroine in disguise to the forefront of attention. Although these relationships are expressed, not in heroic or ballad forms but in those of pastoral romance, even the latter may have been suggested or facilitated by something in the lay. More than once Gamelyn contrasts the town and the wood. The wood is safer than the town and more free: "he moste needes walke in woode that may not walke in towne" (line 672) and

"I rede that we to wode goon ar that we be founde,
Better is vs ther loos than in town y-bounde."
(lines 605-606)

¹Cf. A.H. Thorndike, "The Relation of AYL to Robin Hood Plays", JEGP, IV, 1902, pp.59-69.

²M.C. Bradbrook, *ibid.*, p.201 and cf. also J.Wain, The Living World of Shakespeare, 1964, but cited in the Pelican edn., 1966, p.98, where the Duke's forest life is said to be "specifically compared with that of Robin Hood, that lost hero of England's mythical state of innocence."

On the other hand neither is the wood an easy place to live, but a wild place from which to return as soon as one can:

"Now I see it is mery to be a spencer,
That leuer me were keyes for to bere,
Than walken in this wilde woode my clothes to tere."
(lines 620-622)

It seems that something of the ambivalence of the pastoral is already present in the lay.

Smaller alterations, especially additions, also benefit the novel and the play. The "maister kyng of outlawes" (line 669) becomes Rosalynde's father, the rightful king in exile. Other characters are added in order to put her at the centre of a web of relationships like that which already surrounds Gamelyn: she is given a friend at the court, and by another adroit invention the friend is the daughter of the usurping king. Shakespeare takes this development one stage further when he makes the dukes brothers and the girls cousins: he binds their interlocking relationship tighter than Lodge, but in the way Lodge himself had practised. Similarly, because the wrestling is being promoted by the usurper to divert attention from his misgovernment and is mentioned immediately after Saladyne's cunning villainy, already the bad members of each group are compared and cruelty is linked with court values: whereas Iohan merely hoped Gamelyn might break his neck at the wrestling, Saladyne actually pays the Norman champion to do it (Bullough, II.168).

One result of following the lay is perhaps regrettable. Though Rosader has fallen in love, he nevertheless goes home for a celebration with "a crew of boone companions".¹ Such behaviour, natural enough in a heartwhole Gamelyn, is more surprising in the lovelorn Rosader. Shakespeare presents Orlando's departure more consistently, for since Duke Frederick has heard of his family's allegiance to the rightful Duke the court has become as dangerous to him as to Rosalind. Again the two evil brothers are unconscious allies against the hero, and the ethical and narrative patterns are more tightly interwoven.

After the return home Lodge's debt to Gamelyn decreases. Once the hero has beaten off two more acts of aggression from Saladyne, gone to the woods with Adam, and been succoured by the outlaws, the final battle is the only real borrowing from Gamelyn, and even so its circumstances are altered because Saladyne repents before it occurs. Lodge makes the latter half of the story less bellicose and more pastoral than the lay, and Shakespeare softens the action further: Orlando faces only one more danger from Oliver, there are four love-affairs not three, one rescue not two, two repentances not one, and no final battle. So both the distinguished offspring of the old lay abandon its muscular heroics at the same point, in favour of more purely pastoral matters.

¹ II.173. Orlando has no friends, except old Adam: his courtesy, and his victory, are thereby heightened.

Whereas Shakespeare follows Lodge in extensive borrowing from pastoral romance, he does not follow Lodge's imitations of Lyly's Euphues. The latter of course influences the novel superficially in the title,¹ constantly in the style, and frequently in the motivation. Since Shakespeare's play does not show the influence of Lyly in any of these respects, though in The Two Gentlemen and other early comedies it had been otherwise, it might seem necessary to note only that Shakespeare omits what is apparently ready-made material. The change of motivation however deserves a little longer consideration, since in that respect a weakness of the novel becomes a strength of the play. Lodge's treatment of motives is weak because its imitation of Euphues, so effective in style, is less effective for motivation: whereas Euphues' long and witty arguments with himself enact the "anatomy of wit" and satisfy the expectation that cleverness will undo itself, the same kind of arguments are not so suitable for pastoral romance, whose characters are more numerous, simpler and in essentials nobler than Lyly's. It comes as an unpleasant shock to find, for example, Rosalynde debating with herself whether to love Rosader or not, or Rosader considering at some length whether to rescue his brother (II.174 and 216). Such calculations bespeak a deficiency of the natural impulses and instinctive virtues which romantic heroes and heroines must have. Other lapses of taste are Adam's offer to Rosader of his heart's blood to drink (II.195), or Alinda's promises that if Rosalynde is really a traitor to her father she herself will execute

¹"Rosalynde. Euphues golden legacie...Bequeathed to Philautus sonnes..."

her (II.177). Shakespeare's reasons for omitting such meditations may be the dramatist's need for compression as well as a more fully romantic conception of character, but at all events he avoids absurd extremes of magnanimity and meanness for his protagonists. If such extremes are to be presented, it is not in the protagonists but in subordinate characters like Jaques, Touchstone or Silvius, where the extremes help to define the more agreeable normality of the hero and heroine.

Nevertheless, although Shakespeare made substantial reductions and alterations in the material and method of Rosalynde, the primary response to the novel must be admiration and a sense of how much it offered to the dramatist. It combined elements of ballad, romance, pastoral and the euphuistic novel, on the whole successfully. Indeed perhaps the most impressive thing about the novel is its creation of a complex pastoral narrative from a sparser, unitary original, for the adventures of Rosalynde, her love for Rosader and two more love stories are added to the materials of Gemelyn, and the combining of so many narrative lines in a story which never feels heavy or awkward is a discreet triumph. No wonder Shakespeare was attracted to this novel, which did for him what he usually did to his sources: it gave him a multiple main-plot centred on courtly characters, and a sub-plot centred on less normative, more purely pastoral characters. Much of the articulation of a spectrum of characters who define each other by contrast was

already done in Rosalynde or lay below its surface. Finally Shakespeare retained its narrative shape. Basically novel and play begin with adventures at court or the hero's home, and continue with the escape into Arden of the main characters: thereafter the action is more idyllic, consisting of a series of wooings, punctuated by further arrivals and adventures, until the culmination is a multiple wedding staged by the heroine. As we take the chance, therefore, to compare a Shakespeare comedy with its source in unusual detail, although we shall note an accumulation of differences amounting to different conceptions of character and theme, the more remarkable point is still how close the comedy is to Rosalynde and how dependent on it.

Rosalynde begins, as a novel may, with preliminary matter, but As You Like It resembles the other comedies in having no prologue. Its haste to begin is indeed apparent, because the first words present the youngest son enumerating his grievances and about to clash physically with his oppressor. Orlando's twenty-two lines of self-explanation make an opening economical even by Shakespeare's standards (contrast The Two Gentlemen, Errors, The Merchant or Much Ado); yet they tell us most of the essentials narrated in six pages of Rosalynde. Other changes are not the consequence of the change of medium. When Rosader is given sixteen ploughlands to Saladyne's fourteen (II.161), it is no wonder the latter is jealous, but Shakespeare makes the father's behaviour more sensible and Oliver's malice more unjust

since Orlando is to receive "but poor a thousand crowns" (I.i.2). In any case the major injustice is the neglect of his education. This Shakespeare stresses more than Lodge because a hero of courtesy, the quality to which pastoral romance regularly directs our attention,¹ must be less concerned with material than with spiritual deprivations, at least in his own case. Adam is introduced earlier than Adam Spencer, partly as a confidant, but chiefly as a reminder of the old father he served: both in his person and when he intervenes in the quarrel (I.i.57, 74), he represents the values of family loyalty and obedience to the father's wishes, without Shakespeare's having to use the dying sermon of Sir John. He stands the more naturally for continuity, loyalty and love because he is made more decrepit and vulnerable than Adam Spencer.

The quarrel itself is changed in ways that would be expected of a dramatist working up a novel. An insolent question to Rosader is answered at some length, whereupon Saladyne taunts him at similar length and orders his men to bind him (II.167). Shakespeare's exchanges are much shorter and more numerous, making the crescendo through anger to blows more gradual. Whereas Rosader uses "thou" first and Saladyne retains the distant "you", Shakespeare gives both brothers the tense, unnatural "you", until Orlando strikes Oliver and startles him into "thou...villain". It is more like an actual quarrel: there are no maxims or antitheses, but

¹Cf. Calidore in *F.Q.* VI.

Orlando picks up with increasing bitterness words of Oliver which sting him--"what make you?", "Know you where you are, sir?" and "villain". There are no henchmen by to do Oliver's dirty work and keep him from Orlando's attack: instead old Adam witnesses to the enormity of brothers fighting, and calms them. Once the quarrel has been patched up, in a way that shows the eldest brother to be insincere, attention shifts to the wrestling at court; but since Shakespeare takes over Lodge's idea (not in Gamelyn) that the eldest brother plots with the wrestler to maim or kill the hero he prepares for the wrestling by an exchange between the two conspirators which is an expansion of Lodge (II.168). He omits the second exchange in which Saladyne urges Rosader to wrestle: by making Orlando's decision precede the plot he increases his courage, and avoids the repetition involved in a second exchange between the brothers. The expanded exchange emphasizes the unscrupulous malice of the conspirators, and the danger beneath the gloss of the court; but it also introduces the remaining important elements of the story, the Duke, the usurper, Arden, Rosalind and her friendship with the usurper's daughter. Further to establish our moral bearings the good qualities of Orlando are affirmed by the brother who has just slandered him to Charles: an unwilling, and so authoritative, witness vouches for his worth more strongly than Lodge's longer description of Rosader's.

Novel and play both now set the scene for the hero's wrestling exploit, and do so by showing us Rosalind and her friend.

The main difference is the usual one, that the dramatist cannot present his characters by description, beyond a certain point, but he can let the actor's appearance simply say it for him. Shakespeare usually gives the actor all the necessary help, and he does so here, unfolding the personality of Rosalind in inserted conversations with Celia, the Fool and Le Beau. With Celia Rosalind is downcast, because her father is an exile—a sensitive addition to Rosalynde, where the heroine blooms at court with apparently no recollection of Gerismond's fate (I.ii.1, II.169). With the Fool Rosalind is livelier, though not yet as lively as Celia. With Le Beau however (added to represent the heartless frivolity of the court) she shows a more cutting wit, like that of Orlando's retorts to Oliver: yet when she hears of the injuries done to the old man's three sons—another example of court values, for it is "sport for ladies" (I.ii.123)—sympathy at once replaces wit (line 117). These exchanges are quite lengthy (132 lines) and create a sense of her identity as strong as that which the previous scene creates for Orlando.

The revelation of Rosalind's power~~s~~ of wit and capacity for feeling in these exchanges is the first sign of the essential difference between Rosalynde and the play: the one pleases by elegantly achieving purposes which convention determines, the other pleases by achieving purposes, at once more diverse and more serious, which determine the choice and use of convention. Thus whereas in Lodge the preparations for Rosalynde to meet Rosader are all beauty

and pageantry, their meeting the conventional exchange of love-glances, its sequel the conventional writing of sonnets by the hero and solitary meditation by the heroine, the exchanges which Shakespeare adds contribute to a whole movement of feeling in Rosalind. She pities the young wrestler, admires his victory and (Shakespeare's addition) likes the son of her father's friend (line 214). She is bold enough to give him her chain, a symbolic gift, and yet withdraws, somewhat hurriedly, before a perfect understanding has been reached. A second movement is created around Frederick: he changes from sympathy towards Orlando to a suspicion of his family background which forces the young man to flee (and prepares for the ferocious fear which makes him banish Rosalind in the next scene). Both movements give the scene more humanity than the novel had, and also prepare for later scenes by a smooth and cogent causation not always to be found in the source. They are however created around a climax which is the same in both works, the wrestling: Shakespeare takes this over almost intact, availing himself of the opportunity to expand by visible action on stage what the novelist could only describe.

Shakespeare now omits the third of Saladyne's four unbrotherly acts because he wants to get his hero to Arden promptly, and perhaps because Saladyne's villainy and Rosader's naivety are somewhat repetitive. He continues instead with a conversation between Rosalind and Celia, which occurs at the same point as "Rosalynds Passion" and "Rosalynds Madrigal" (II.174-175). Beyond

the basic idea, of a passage in which the heroine expresses the disturbance in her caused by love, Shakespeare takes little from Lodge here. He gives Rosalind a short conversation instead of a long soliloquy, and it is all in prose. Her feelings do not exclude pity for her father, though she has by now matured to preoccupation rather with her child's father (I.iii.11): since Rosalynde did not express care for her father before she met Rosader, her feelings now lack this dimension of growth. Finally Shakespeare's heroine, though somewhat subdued, has still a livelier wit than Rosalynde: already the play's varying decorum of styles assists that defining of characters by contrasts which the pervasive euphuism of the novel had hampered.

When the usurper enters to banish the heroine (II.176, I.iii.33), Shakespeare makes several small changes. In one way he makes the banishment less of a surprise, for Le Beau has just told Orlando that the Duke's "malice 'gainst the lady/Will suddenly break forth" (I.ii.261-262). In another way he achieves greater surprise, for Le Beau has not said what form the malice will take: by the more violent, abrupt, angry entry which he gives Frederick, the shock to Rosalind and the courage of both girls' responses are greater than in Lodge. (Shakespeare uses to the full the advantages drama has over narrative.) He also changes the motives of all three parties. Torismond reflects that Rosalynde's beauty may cause some peer to marry her "and then in his wifes right attempt the kingdome", but Frederick's motives are more compelling because less specific: general mistrust of Rosalind (line 51), vague fear of the people

(line 75), and a heavy-handed appeal to his daughter's jealousy (lines 76-78) suggest a more unbalanced tyrant than Torismond's logical calculations. Shakespeare follows the pattern of the girls' responses, but radically alters their effect. Though Rosalynde "boldly brake out in reverend tearmes to have cleared her selfe" (II.177) Lodge does not record what she said, and proceeds instead to Alinda's defence of Rosalynde. Shakespeare expands the "reverend tearmes" into the series of questions which the startled Rosalind asks Frederick: she is allowed to plead well, and then Celia begs that her friendship with Rosalind be not broken. As usual the set orations are broken down into quick exchanges with moments of calm, tension and explosion. The close of the three-way interview is also altered. Torismond is enraged by his daughter's opposition and banishes her with Rosalynde, on pain of death—"so suspicious and feareful is the conscience of an usurper" (II.178). Frederick merely tells Celia she is a fool: it is she who asks him to banish her too. The nobility of Celia's friendship is better confirmed by her readiness to suffer exile than by the weird magnanimity of Alinda's offer to execute Rosalynde herself if she be really a traitor, and the change also gives more interest to the dialogue of the two ladies after the Duke has swept out. Since Lodge's ladies have both been banished, there seems little reason why Alinda should comfort Rosalynde: Alinda has, if anything, greater reason to grieve. But in the play Rosalind does have more cause (line 91) since Celia has not been banished, and she has. So Celia has to convince her that the Duke has, in effect,

banished her, since she will not be parted from her friend; but because she has to work hard to convince Rosalind before they can settle down to plan escape, Shakespeare is able to keep his scene moving between the interview with Frederick and the planning of escape. Though "Alindas Comfort to Perplexed Rosalynde" was no help--it is even more elegantly erudite than usual, and includes three Latin quotations--the addition of the girls' apparent inequality of fortune makes the transition to plans of escape interesting.

Having reduced the length of comforting needed to restore the heroine's verve, Shakespeare expands the conversation in which they decide to make for Arden and adopt disguise. Lodge does not actually mention Arden, but Shakespeare perceives the need to; he makes Celia mention it, and it is the last stage of Rosalind's recovery of spirits. Soon she is taking the initiative once more, which Rosalynde does not do so plainly in Lodge's short exchange (II.179-180). Shakespeare takes their council more slowly. Celia, not Rosalind, suggests inconspicuous dress for them both. Then it is Rosalind's amendment that she put on male dress: this speech shows restored vitality, for in imagination she is already playing up to her role. It is no surprise to find that Rosalind's adoption of male disguise is taken more slowly and emphatically than in the source, for Shakespeare is using for the third time a romance motif of proven value. Thus when the girls take new names he pauses to explain their choices, although Lodge had not. Next Rosalind (again)

suggests taking the Fool along for company: since he has already appeared in company with the ladies, it was probably from the first Shakespeare's wish that the Fool should appear in Arden. Finally the practical Celia remembers to get their jewels together, whereas Lodge does not specify who thought of this.

Now that the ladies are on their way to Arden, about which we have heard several times, Shakespeare adds a scene which does not advance the story at all. Its purpose is to show what sort of people are in Arden, how they contrast with "the envious court" so prominent in Act I, and how they react to the life there. It has its source in the pastoral genre as such rather than in Lodge, who does not say much about Gerismond.¹ Later on Shakespeare adds other pastoral scenes, which do not involve major characters or move the story along, but exist instead to entertain (especially in the case of scenes which lead up to a song), to explore the pastoral world and to criticize the pastoral idea. Such scenes are II.v, IV.ii and V.iii. They all contain a song, but they also present a character whom Shakespeare has added: Jaques in the first two, Touchstone in the last. The scenes, and the comments--implicit as well as explicit--of the added characters, give solidity to the setting in which hero and heroine move; and complexity, inasmuch as it is these characters who voice the critique of pastoral.

The next scene (II.ii), in which Frederick finds out that the ladies have disappeared along with the Fool, is again added.

¹One reference is at II.203, tucked away in the middle of something quite different.

For one thing since Torismond banished both girls their disappearance need not surprise or alarm him; but Shakespeare achieves more than consistency by adding the scene. He shows Frederick once more suspicious (II.ii.2) and in order to bind his main plot together more tightly he inserts Orlando's rumoured involvement in the flight. The two objects of Frederick's suspicion being joined, he acts at once, making Oliver responsible for his brother;¹ and the short scene therefore prepares for the interview Oliver has with the usurper (III.i), which forces him too to come to Arden. Yet it ties together other aspects of the story, since by placing the discovery scene after the first Arden scene Shakespeare suggests a lapse of dramatic time by a lapse of actual time. Placing Rosalind's next scene after a scene involving Orlando he again uses the lapse of actual time to suggest the lapse of travelling time which makes the girls weary when next they are seen (II.iv.1).

Lodge's narrative keeps with Rosalinde after their departure to Arden, moving straight into her first meetings with Montanus and Coridon. Shakespeare has still one more scene to come before his corresponding scene (II.iv): this is the departure of the hero for Arden, which Lodge kept until the girls were assimilated there (II.191). The advantages of the transposition are that, without realizing it, Orlando escapes only just in time because not only Oliver but the usurper means him harm (II.ii.17); and that since the hero sets out for Arden before the heroine arrives there the

¹ A splendid irony that it takes a tyrant to make Oliver answer for his brother, in fear as he should in love (cf. III.i.)

certainty of their meeting is the greater—it seems that Fortune is becoming kindly instead of fickle, as soon as flight to Arden begins. Here as often Shakespeare breaks up Lodge's longer sequences of narrative in order to bind events together more closely: his sequences proceed almost parallel with one another, with the result that juxtaposition allows constant connection and comment. Orlando's departure is caused by a further threat from the treacherous brother, but the details are not based on Lodge. In his short scene Shakespeare replaces actual injury and a double battle with a threatened harm, whose danger is more economical and whose vague deceit seems more awful, than the prolonged fighting which Lodge takes over from Gamelyn.¹

Throughout this part of the play Shakespeare is less interested in physical action than in relationships. He gives Adam a speech, before he reveals the actual danger, in which the old man (embodying once more the old-fashioned virtues of loyalty and family affection) cries out against the poisoned world in which Orlando's very virtues are punished (II.iii.2-15). Then with admirable consistency he persuades Orlando to take his own lifetime's savings, and trusts to providence (lines 43-45). In gratitude Orlando praises the old man's "constant service" and sense of duty, and Adam responds with another affirmation of "truth and loyalty" (line 70). Though the scene advances the story as much as is needed, its main effect is to praise the good relationship of a world where people

¹Even so AYL contains as much violence on stage as most of the comedies, and more than LLL, MND, MV and MA.

serve one another, contrasted with the court world of bad relationship, where people injure one another. Such a wholesome world awaits them in Arden, as we know but they must discover: so this scene looks back to II.i, forward to II.v and II.vii in which the values of Arden are tested and approved. Lodge supplies a hint of this movement in describing how Rosader meets Gerismond (II.196) but Shakespeare gives it prominence and reads it back into all the scenes involving Adam.

The ladies and the Fool now arrive in Arden. Because they have not previously have seen in their disguise roles, Shakespeare underlines the visual fact by Rosalind's joke about being now a man (II.iv.4-7). Lodge mentioned the dangers of the journey at this point of the narrative (II.180),¹ but Shakespeare stresses their weariness, creating a little spectrum of reactions to fatigue. Touchstone's are caustic, and at once a variety of attitudes to the pastoral setting is developed: "Ay, now am I in Arden; the more fool I" (lines 13-14). Lodge takes his time in describing their first meetings in Arden and their absorption into its society: he relishes his first opportunity to present pastoral wooing, and we find two poems which Montanus has carved on trees, the "pleasant eglog" between him and Coridon (II.183-187) and one of his sonnets a little later (II.190). Shakespeare introduces Rosalind to two equivalent characters, but briskly: there are no inset verses,² and no teasing remarks (yet) by Ganymede about the foibles of

¹Lodge mentions weariness later (II.187-188) when they ask shelter of Coridon.

²Perhaps the many songs, and Orlando's verses in III.ii, were deemed enough.

women. As the exchange between the love-sick swain and the older shepherd is marked by a transition from prose to verse, Shakespeare may be preserving something of the formality of the eclogue.¹ But the two do not, as in Lodge, speak the same kind of verse: Corin is down to earth and laconic while Silvius is lyrically impassioned, and when Corin does not give him the answers he wants he soars into an extravagantly Petrarchan appeal to Corin, love and Phebe. Here, in the three sentences of three lines each, followed by the threefold invocation of Phebe's name; is Shakespeare's brief counterpart of Montanus' mellifluous melancholy; but the presence of the experienced, realistic Corin speaking blank verse, shows that what is the accepted convention of the novel is only a part of the view of life presented by the play. The reaction to Silvius' extremism is qualified further by the presence of watchers. In Lodge also the ladies watch, but when Alinda speaks to the two shepherds (II.187) she goes straight to her own needs: Shakespeare adds the sympathetic comment of the heroine (in blank verse) and the parodic story of Jane Smile from Touchstone (in prose).

Celia, whose exhaustion is taken more seriously than Alinda's, (cf. Adam in II.vi-vii), has been silent all this time. Her second speech of the scene (lines 59-61) is her second appeal for help. In place of Alinda's well-modulated appeal to the shepherds ("Although not by Love, yet by Fortune, I am a distressed Gentlewoman..."), Shakespeare substitutes a simple, faint appeal to her companions:

¹Of its diction and ideas he uses a little, e.g. the iteration "Phoebe" (II.184) and the argument that old age has made Coridon unsympathetic (II.185).

it is Rosalind who appeals to the charity of Arden. The terms of her appeal and Corin's reply remind us of the previous scene (and II.vii) by its emphasis on such relationship words as "friend", "gentle sir", "love", "entertainment", "pity" and "hospitality", few of which occur in Lodge at this juncture (II.188). Lodge is more interested in giving Coridon generalities about the greater contentment of living in the country than in the court, even though they blend ill with the fact that he is in danger of being put out of his farm by a change of ownership (II.188-189). Shakespeare has no such contradiction. He does not make Corin praise his manner of life,¹ but gives duly serious emphasis to the churlishness of his absentee employer. There is bad relationship even in Arden, and Corin's troubles (about which he is more realistic than Coridon) are integrated with the serious concerns of the play. So when the ladies buy the farm for Corin, in return for his services, they benefit one another, as in all wholesome relationships; but this balance, and Corin's wage increase (II.iv.89), are Shakespeare's addition to Lodge. The rest of Lodge's pastoral sequence reverts to Montanus and his troubles, and shows the ladies next day dressing as shepherd and shepherdess and looking after sheep in great contentment. All this disappears in As You Like It. Instead, before going back to Orlando and Adam, Shakespeare gives a scene (II.v) which praises the contentment of Arden in a different

¹The praise of Arden has already been transferred to the Duke in II.1.

way: it does not ignore the winter there, and Jaques' sourness further offsets and criticizes the sweetness of happy rusticity.

The short scene following is much changed from Lodge. Adam Spencer's long speech on mutability (II.194-195) dwindles to a gasping cry of hunger (II.vi.1-3). Now only Adam is faint—as one would expect of a man so much older than the muscular hero.¹ Shakespeare consistently differentiates the behaviour of the two men: in Lodge each faints and wants to die if only this might benefit the other, but Shakespeare takes the chance to show Orlando comforting Adam as Adam had first comforted him. This counterpoint again helps to stress the mutuality of good relationship, and prepares too for the climax of that theme in the next scene.

When the fugitives meet the society of Arden for the first time, appeal for help and are kindly received, these events have been prepared for by two scenes showing their journey thither, and two scenes showing the outlaws' way of life; and the scene in which the girls arrive in Arden invites comparison and contrast. So this second arrival is part of a complex pattern of ideas and juxtapositions. The pattern is often Shakespeare's articulation of elements which appear, conventional and unconsidered, in Lodge: and particularly so with the second arrival. But before he begins

¹The contradictions caused by Lodge's habit of taking things to extremes are illustrated in this sentence: "...Adam Spencer (being olde) began first to faint,...looking about him, espied where Rosader laye as feeble and as ill perplexed..." (II.194). It is not clear who is more faint, and who faints first.

it Shakespeare adds one more tableau of forest life: the Duke and Jaques, who have been seen only apart, at last meet on stage. The contented sentimentalist and cynical melancholic clash as a final preparation for their interaction with Orlando and Adam. Their eighty-seven lines are of course an enormous expansion of Lodge's simpler scene-settings: "It chaunced that day, that Gerismond the lawfull king of France banished by Torismond, who with a lustie crue of Outlawes lived in that forest, that day in honour of his Birth made a Feast to all his bolde yeomen,¹ and frolickt it with store of wine and venison, sitting all at a long table under the shadowe of lymon trees²" (II.196). Shakespeare's tableau and movements, though not his language, come straight from Lodge--the outdoor feast, outlaws' costume, men bringing in wine and venison. Once Shakespeare has made it dramatic one perceives how Lodge's narrative asked to be dramatized: Shakespeare's inventive powers can be as plain in what he selects as in what he adds.

The encounter of the Duke with Orlando is, unusually, of roughly equal length with Lodge's counterpart (II.196-197); perhaps both writers regarded the meeting as a climax, though their emphases differ. When Rosader sees the outlaws feasting he appeals for food and issues a general challenge; only if this request is refused does he vow to "have amongst you with my sword." His speech remains

¹The phrase recalls Robin Hood's men.

²The flora of romance, as often.

courtly, and polite on the whole: the only exception in style is that he calls the Duke "thou", and in content that he ends with a threat. Gerismond pities him, welcomes him, and invites him to be "Lord of the feast". Rosader goes first to fetch Adam Spencer; he carries him in on his back, to applause, and makes him Lord of the feast. In the rest of the scene they eat, Rosader tells his tale and Gerismond reveals his identity: given news of Rosalynde the Duke falls melancholy, and the birthday feast breaks up. These latter incidents are, if anything, more important to Lodge than the early stages of the encounter; but Shakespeare is so much more interested in the early stages that the narration of their respective misfortunes is done under cover of a song.¹ Nine lines suffice for the Duke to welcome Orlando as Sir Rowland's son: there is no repetition of events already presented, no mention of Rosalind,² no melancholy, no untoward conclusion to the feast, but an insistence on "welcome" (lines 167, 171, 195, 198).

In this earlier part of Lodge's scene which Shakespeare liked and followed, changes have been made. First the three set speeches—Rosader's, Gerismond's and Rosader's again—are broken up into rapid exchanges, involving Jaques as third party, until Orlando's long formal appeal and its long formal answer. Whereas Rosader declined from civility to mild threats, Orlando becomes civil after bursting upon the feast more rudely. Rosader's confused chivalric challenge to arms becomes Orlando's appeal to humanity. When the Duke offers

¹ Since songs and music were usual at banquets, decorum as well as entertainment is being served.

² Orlando, unlike Rosader, does not know that Rosalind is banished: this may be because Shakespeare is omitting Lodge's detail as repetitive, or because his ignorance makes more natural Orlando's failure to recognize Ganymede.

hospitality, Orlando like Rosader goes to fetch Adam before eating himself. The graceful compliment Gerismond pays Rosader, and Rosader Adam, might well have been of use to Shakespeare; but at any rate he seizes on the visual and moral implications of the entry of Adam Spencer, helpless by reason of hunger aggravated by old age: "so feeble he was that hee could not goe: whereupon Rosader got him up on his backe, and brought him to the place. Which when Gerismond & his men saw, they greatly applauded their league of friendship" (II,196).

What however is the effect of selecting these elements and changing them? The abrupt entry of Orlando with his sword drawn is an extension of the situation in two directions: heroic violence and ludicrous melodrama. The addition of Jaques' mockery undercuts the hero; but he soon falls silent, for he has fulfilled his function of diversifying the responses to Orlando's irruption. The Duke occupies a mid-way position, thanks to the addition of Jaques: as detached as Jaques, yet as serious as Orlando. In answer to the Duke's comments, though hardly in answer to those of Jaques, Orlando can recover his self-possession: he is induced slowly to abandon his grandiose gesture for civil request. Finally as the Duke's answers stress "gentleness" and "welcome" (II.vii.102-103, 105)—words that occur in Lodge¹ and may have guided the moral patterning of this scene—Orlando regains balance completely: he makes an eloquent, formal appeal to "gentleness", that humanity which the

¹"Gentlemen" twice, and "welcome" once, II.196.

Duke first mentioned. The Duke's reply is equally formal; he answers the accumulating grounds for pity, adding a word here and there to show his sympathy--thus "pity" (line 117) becomes "sacred pity" (line 123)--and authenticates his compassion by referring to the gentleness which was the climax of Orlando's appeal (line 124). The overall difference of effect between Rosalynde and As You Like It at this point therefore is that Shakespeare's exchanges move more and have a comprehensible direction: in place of the medley of Rosader's motives and arguments, masked but not altogether excused by the homogeneous smoothness of Lodge's style, Shakespeare has created a progression, from violent mistrust, and the risk of a deflating response, to a heartfelt appeal to humane relationship. When the Duke's acceptance of the appeal vindicates Arden as the opposite of the denaturing court, a part of the play's dramatic and moral movement is concluded. Here once more however Shakespeare has achieved intensity by adding complexity, for whereas Lodge moves straight from Rosader's acceptance to his bearing in of Adam, Shakespeare inserts two varying responses to the spectacle of need before Orlando returns bearing Adam. The Duke's is characteristically generalized, but sympathetic: when he mentions the commonplace that the world is like a theatre, he gives Jaques a cue to moralize the spectacle from his more nihilist standpoint. Accordingly Adam is carried in immediately after Jaques' savage description of the seventh age of man. As has often been said, he is both a confirm-

ation of the description, for he is "sans teeth"; and a denial of it since he is not "mere oblivion"—he has not forgotten the value of loyalty, nor has he been forgotten. The addition makes Adam, and the other participants, more than ever representative men: what they do and say here involves judgment about the nature of man, and about the life of men in society. Though the breadth of conception, and the complexity of its execution, are beyond Lodge he supplies the first essential ingredients: men in need, an old man called Adam,¹ and an implied dispute over man's worth (which was sometimes present in pastoral debate generally). Shakespeare as it were gratefully accepts and articulates the meagre humanity of the words "Therefore if thou be a Gentleman, give meate to men, and to such men as are everie way worthie of life."

The long forest scene is followed, exactly as in Lodge, by the quarrel of the usurper with the elder brother (II. 197-198, III.i). But the sequence of events and motives, differs. Torismond uses Saladyne's injuries to Rosader as a pretext to confiscate their property, which is his real object. As Frederick seizes Oliver's property to make sure he does as he is bid, his suspicious, tyrannical nature is stressed rather than crude greed. Mention of the injuries done to the hero is transferred from the usurper to the elder brother, to give a neat irony to the conversation: Saladyne is taxed with these, but Oliver boasts of them, hoping—in the court world of inverted values—to earn favour thereby. Shakespeare perhaps recalled Torismond's word for Saladyne, "villain" (II.199),

¹"Adam" in the New Testament is often a synonym for "man", which is in fact its meaning in Hebrew.

in adding the splendid ironic recoil: "More villain thou. Well, push him out of doors" (III.1.15).

Frederick's last scene is placed where it can reinforce the contrast of court values with the values of Arden, which has freely accepted those whom the court could not. Henceforward the main interest is to be the forest life and the interactions of its inhabitants. The latter are made more varied than in Rosalynde, for whether one considers the natives or the new arrivals, Shakespeare has added: the realistic yokels Audrey, William and Martext to the conventional inhabitants of pastoral, and the astringent Jaques and Touchstone to the usual romance protagonists. The effect of the greater variety is to entertain, as comedy must; but it is more significant that in Shakespeare's hands it yields a treatment of pastoral ideas which is simultaneously more sophisticated and more serious than Lodge, albeit they are often working with the same generic and narrative materials. The difference is ultimately impossible to define, though easy to sense, but can be hinted by saying that what Shakespeare adds helps the characters and their attitudes to life to define and place each other. In particular the manner of the juxtapositions suggests that the author is appreciating the conventions of pastoral romance at the same time as he laughs at them. This sympathetic exploitation of what Lodge generally takes for granted is among the most satisfying features of the play, because it is at once witty and serious. The opportunity can perhaps be taken to examine its operation in a little more detail, in the part of the play which now ensues--the first in which the court and its attendant ills are less insistently present.

Still following Lodge's narrative sequence Shakespeare now shows the hero adorning the forest with love-verses: a harmless activity which again contrasts with the abrasiveness of the court. On the other hand Orlando's behaviour is so quintessentially pastoral—the right thing to be doing in such a forest—that it seems as conventional as his melodramatic interruption of the banquet. Once more however what is purely within the convention in Lodge is judged and criticized by another character, the Fool, perhaps precisely for its conventionality. So much is obvious later in the scene, since lines 86-159 are practical criticism of the verses themselves, and in lines 334-336 Rosalind teases the poet for festooning bushes and maiming trees. But the style of the first soliloquizing verses has already implied these criticisms: they are such verses as Navarre and his bookmen perpetrated (III IV.iii),¹ but they may borrow such conventional words as "chaste", "fair" and "virtue" from Rosader's "Sonnetto", which he engraves on a myrtle tree (II.199). Shakespeare spares Orlando the labour of carving his sonnets on a tree, but incorporates the idea in "the climactically absurd lines:

Run, run, Orlando; carve on every tree
The fair, the chaste and unexpressive she,
(III.ii.9-10)

where the idea of the fervent lover sprinting from tree to tree, with his jack-knife at the ready, seeking to express what he knows already is inexpressible ('unexpressive'), cannot possibly be taken

¹The metre and rhyme of Orlando's sonnet correspond to those of Navarre and Longaville. His second poem (trochaic couplets) corresponds to Dumain's.

seriously".¹

Shakespeare now inserts the dialogue between Corin and the Fool concerning pastoral life, thereby developing a spectrum of reactions to pastoral values, not all of which are so blithely enthusiastic as Orlando's. The juxtapositions are Shakespeare's own, except that Corin's sturdy contentment bears a general resemblance to Coridon's earlier praise of the simple life (II.180-182); but insofar as Corin's style is plain like his manner of life (whereas Coridon even quoted Latin) a different conception of pastoral decorum must be operative in the play. The conclusion of the exchange moves a little away from pastoral to talk of bawds, cuckolding and copulation (lines 69-75), the less dignified accompaniments of mating: in and through this idea the transition is made to Rosalind and her mating. It is against such a background that "Ganymede" enters, reading another of Orlando's effusions; and though Lodge gave Rosader more poems overall, but only one at this point, Shakespeare gives him three here, none elsewhere, and nobody else gets any. Thus he concentrates their effect. He also develops it, for the verses change. The new batch are in short couplets and as conventional as before, but this time the Fool seizes on their monotonous ending to parody and ruin them, (once more directing attention, if only for a moment, to the biological underside of romantic love). Neither the verse nor the scene will become saccharine: by now the

¹G.K. Hunter, William Shakespeare. The Late Comedies, p.36.

risk is rather that the clever critics may overreach. So when Celia enters, with yet more verses, they are heard to the end: such criticism as they receive is milder, and comes from Rosalind, for the Fool is dismissed and Celia never criticizes. Moreover this poem is beautiful, with more variety and an unobtrusive rhetorical shape.¹ The development added by Shakespeare is an ascent of feeling: we are nearing the moment when the lovers meet again. Shakespeare moves to this meeting more slowly and indirectly than Lodge, who goes directly from the reading of the sonnet to the sighting of Rosader: both are done by both girls together, and Ganymede accosts him almost immediately afterwards (II.200), whereas Shakespeare, having already added a hundred or so lines of verses and teasing, now adds a passage where Rosalind is herself teased. He creates this pleasant opportunity for himself by making Celia see Orlando first, and uses it to present Rosalind so excited and self-contradictory that love shows through her ebullient playing of the disguise-role.² When he does appear it is with Jaques, and a bout of wit between the two men complementing that between the two girls is added before Rosalind accosts him. Both wit-exchanges however go beyond wit to revelation of feeling; for Rosalind's eager interest in the author of the verses in effect proclaims her love, as Celia perceives, and Orlando outspokenly

¹ A few words may have entered it from Lodge, but from his narrative hereabouts rather than from Rosader's verses (see below on verbal borrowings).

² The detail of Orlando's still incipient beard (line 192) may have been recalled from the beginning of *Rosalynde* (II.166). If so Shakespeare's retentive memory for striking detail is exemplified. The detail recurs at line 350.

rejects Jaques and all he stands for. Because "Signior Love" speaks up for unassuming self-awareness against ostentatious raillery (III.ii.263), we endorse his outright rejection of pessimism--as Shakespeare himself appears to do since he lets Orlando expel Jaques from the stage.

The conversation between Orlando and Rosalind which follows is their first in Arden. It is the climax towards which the other encounters have been tending, and to which in their variety they contribute an ironic but sympathetic perspective. The conversation is not close to Lodge's equivalent, and the elements which do correspond tend to be transposed. For instance Rosalind does not ask her lover about his love-sickness, as Rosalynde does, but instead asks him the time; and whereas Lodge mentions the absence of timepieces in Arden in an innocuous way (II.211)--"tis time to goe to dinner: for the Sunne and our stomackes are Shepheards dialls"--Rosalind's question is deliberately impertinent. She is flouting the convention of pastoral timelessness in order to set up for herself the opportunity to tease and provoke her lover. Shakespeare maintains her teasing gaiety throughout their conversation: the tone of voice is almost all that it owes to Lodge, and he has sifted away all the poems and maxims which mute Rosalynde's vivacity. Another borrowing transposed is the talk about the lover's appearance. In Lodge the ladies espy him in the appropriate pose of a melancholy lover¹--"folded armes", "passionate sighes" and so forth

¹Which Shakespeare exploited humorously in TGV II.1, and above all in TN for Malvolio. The melancholy lover is illustrated, from Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy and Inigo Jones, in G.K. Hunter, Shakespeare. The Later Comedies, facing p.32.

(II.200). Rosader sighs and passions from time to time subsequently, in and out of verse. Orlando is based on Rosader to the extent that Celia sees him "under a tree, like a dropp'd acorn", "stretch'd along like a wounded knight" (lines 220, 226), and presumably this is another posture of love-melancholy. When Rosalind and the audience see him however he is "point-device" (line 353) and she twits him for being indecorously spruce. Once more Shakespeare takes a conventional idea from Lodge, only to make fun of it and turn it upside down.

The second exchange between the lovers follows sooner in Lodge than in the play: two pages of chaffing between the women, and "Rosalynde Passionate Alone" intervene (II.203-205), but Shakespeare includes not only a scene corresponding to these pages (III.iv) but two other scenes of pastoral wooing (III.iii and III.v). He therefore prepares for the next meeting of the most important couple, which is to be the "curing" of Orlando's love by coming daily to woo "Ganymede" (arranged at III.ii.391). Two very different couples now appear, in scenes which have been carefully placed. Touchstone has found himself a mate and is about to enter matrimony before the hedge-priest: this wooing is of course Shakespeare's addition. It parodies that of the principals, but also that of Phebe and Silvius who are found in Lodge more prominently than in the play. The health of the central relationship is reaffirmed because the main couple differ not only from the precious pastoral couple (from whom they

differed little in Lodge) but also from the realistic misalliance which is added. The variety of love-relationships define each other and the norm, as in II.vii, where the Duke places the extremism of Orlando and Jaques.

Shakespeare's scene for the ladies alone (III.iv) has no resemblance to the corresponding passage of the novel, except the general one, that the heroine is teased for her love by her friend. When he makes Rosalind sad, like her original, it is for a different reason, that Orlando is late. True, there are no clocks in the forest, and his appointment was only with Ganymede anyway; but that does not prevent her being charmingly and unreasonably anxious. In the latter part of the scene Corin, like Coridon (II.225, 227), introduces the "pageant" of love and disdain played between Silvius and Phebe (II.227-233): it is based on Lodge, but Shakespeare brings the encounter forward in order to place it among the other wooings.

Formality is the keynote of the little pageant, in novel and play. In the novel, after Lodge has set the scene, not forgetting to describe Phoebe's gorgeous apparel, he moves into verse, with a sonnet by Montanus; then—his passions being "extreame"—one in French; then a sonnet of rejection by Phoebe (II.228-230). Even though their exchanges subsequently descend to prose, formality is still evident in the long plaint of Montanus answered by a long disdainful speech of Phoebe. By contrast the exchanges become much

shorter when Ganymede intervenes (II.231-232). Shakespeare adopts this pattern. He has already suggested the formal, theatrical quality of the scene when Corin calls it a "pageant" (III.iv.47) and extends the acting metaphor into Rosalind's reply (III.iv.53-54). He omits the sonnets, not to mention the French, but puts the whole scene into verse. Verse by itself would not necessarily make the scene formal, but the first speeches are made so by their length and their ample, generalizing rhetoric. This quality is the more noticeable after Rosalind's entry: her more colloquial, vigorous speech shatters the artificial diction, marking more clearly than Lodge's language the change of direction. The rest of the scene is on the new, less formal level, except that Silvius remains as elegiac as ever.

In detail the two scenes do not correspond much. Silvius' opening plea is kept very short. This character conforms the most to pastoral conventions: in a play which is more robust than Rosalynde not much can be seen of him, and then not in close proximity to mordant characters like Jaques or Touchstone. Phebe in reply is perversely literal rather than disdainful (III.v.8-27, II.231), her literalism itself exposing the conventional extremism of Silvius' language. She rejects his love rather than—as Lodge's Phoebe does—all love. Rosalind's interruption is made longer and more devastating. She denies the premise, which even Rosalynde accepted, that Phebe has any beauty: she is perverse herself (Phebe clearly is pretty), and

directly personal, even rude, where Rosalynde stayed more within the convention and offered elegant maxims in the course of an abstract argument against those who say love is not for them. The difference can be seen in these passages: "'Such (my faire Shepheardesse) as disdaine in youth desire in age, and then are they hated in the winter, that might have been loved in the prime'" (II.232), and "Sell when you can; you are not for all markets" (line 60). The latter hit brings into the pastoral love-situation an unromantic, virtually commercial view of matchmaking; but as both views are extreme, the ideal no doubt occupies a middle position.

When Phoebe responds perversely to rebuke by loving her accuser, the paradox is heightened in the play since Rosalind is so much more offensive. Phebe's half-admitting replies are, for once, less broken up than Lodge's (II.232). As might be expected of one suddenly confused by new feeling, Lodge's Phoebe stops in mid-sentence, twice. Shakespeare's Phebe is different, though in this case one may prefer Lodge's idea, and is by no means reduced to tearful blushes. She is given more iron, and keeps up the conversation. Since she is told Ganymede's abode, we may expect further encounters--and, speculating why Ganymede should want them, guess at the solution she will engineer to the wooing complication. The next stage of the incipient triangle is quite different in Shakespeare. His Phebe does not sicken for love: as before she is more robust and lacks the sentimental extremism of Lodge--in fact no one except Silvius

weeps or languishes for love in the play, though Rosalynde abounds in such "marks of love". After Rosalind has gone we are back with the pastoral couple again; but in this addition to Lodge, we find that their relationship has been changed by what has intervened. Phebe is more sympathetic now she herself is in love. She is also struggling to persuade herself that she is not in love (lines 108 ff.), yet is clearly obsessed with Ganymede's words and looks (the red-and-white of his complexion is the only detail based on Lodge, II.238). Finally she deceives Silvius in sending Ganymede a letter of supposed scorn. All the while Silvius continues to express devotion, and is as it were a fixed point by which to measure the more changeable, lively Phebe. The developments in feeling, and the animated variety, of this latter part of the scene are all Shakespeare's addition to the slow-moving, sentimental conventions within which his source stays.

The second forest meeting of Rosalind and Orlando is preceded by the heroine's exchange with Jaques, just as their first followed Orlando's exchange with him. Both point up the good health of being in love compared with the affectations of the humorous melancholic. Shakespeare substitutes for Lodge's long series of sonnets, speeches and "The Wooing Eglogue betwixt Rosalynde and Rosader" (II.206-213) a teasing conversation of his own invention: it begins where III.iv began, with Orlando's unpunctuality, and once more it will be valuable to examine the force of Shakespeare's additions.

Having exaggerated the enormity of Orlando's unpunctuality

(he was less than an hour late, but that is no way to mollify a lady), Rosalind proceeds to undermine his exaggerations. The abrupt turnabout is amusing, but also in character. What she denies are such conventional hyperboles of love-expression as the lethal power of the lady's frown (IV.1.97) or the possibility that a rejected lover will die of his disappointment (line 82): either they did not die (line 98) or did not die as a direct result of failing in love (lines 83 ff.). This in turn is an exaggeration (she chooses her instances carefully), but is a very practical way of disarming the power of cliché as casual self-pity or attempted moral pressure. She is particularly ingenious, and also quite grave, in rebutting the cliché by appeal from a false to a true conception of time, and its consequence death, for the mention of time not only returns our thoughts to the initial exchange about punctuality, but introduces a sombre note into the gay timelessness of the wooing-game and the forest life: "Et in Arcadia Ego" is the force of her realization that "men have died from time to time, and worms have eaten them." It is perhaps the half-playful awe of this thought that moves her into the wedding ceremony (after a mock catechism, lines 101-106); that is, marriage is subconsciously sensed as an answer to mortality. Deep matters are of course being lightly touched on in her speeches but the ebullient freshness of their treatment, heightened by their contrast with and demolition of the tired clichés of male despair, gives the scene a resonance not to be found in Lodge's formal eclogue.

Shakespeare seems therefore to pay Lodge the compliment of contradicting and rejecting him, though he is contradicting also the commonplaces of their genre. Of direct indebtedness there is none until the mock wedding¹ ceremony (II.214, IV.i.108 ff.). It is significant, and in accord with Shakespeare's continual differentiation of the ladies, that whereas in the novel *Alinda* suggests the ceremony, Shakespeare gives all the initiatives of the scene to Rosalind. Lodge's narrative runs:

And thereupon (quoth Aliena) Ile play the priest;
 from this day forth Ganimede shall call thee
 husband, and thou shalt call Ganimede wife, and so
 weeles have a marriage. Content (quoth Rosader) and
 laught. Content (quoth Ganimede) and changed as
 redde as a rose: and so with a smile and a blush,
 they made up this jesting match, that after proovde
 to a marriage in earnest; Rosader full little
 thinking he had wooed and wonne his Rosalynde.

This wedding is rather hurried, especially the speeches (unusually for Lodge). Like any ceremony however it transfers easily to the theatre and becomes a natural climax. It will be played much more slowly than one reads the words, but even so the words are considerably expanded. The choice of a source for expansion is natural yet inspired, no other than the marriage service of the Book of Common Prayer;² it includes however several departures from the standard texts in the form of prompts and interruptions from Rosalind, who all but plays the parts of priest and bridegroom as well as her own. The scene closes with further teasing of Orlando by Rosalind, then of Rosalind by Celia--the pattern as before. There is teasing at

¹ Anticipated by, and contrasted with, the uncompleted wedding of Touchstone and Audrey (III.iii).

² H.R.D. Anders, Shakespeare's Books, pp.203-209.

this point in Lodge too (II.214-215), but it did not suggest any details to Shakespeare, who adds to the situation as a whole a vivacity which is probably unrivalled in his plays, let alone in the novel.

After this scene he adds another hunting scene (IV.ii); the ceremony of crowning the man who killed the deer with its horns, and the ribald song, give pleasant respite from the wooing matters which have monopolized the previous five scenes. Bullough suggests that the song about the horns was suggested by Ganymede's first words to Rosader: "'What newes Forrester? hast thou wounded some deere, and lost him in the fall? Care not man, for so small a losse, thy fees was but the skinne, the shoulder, and the hornes'" (II.200 and n.1). Indeed the whole scene may have been suggested by this passage, for Shakespeare worked up other scenes for the outlaws from the slightest of hints in Lodge, usually as here transposed. He was perhaps predisposed to notice such hints by the fact of working with pastoral materials, together with the liking for hunting scenes that is suggested by their presence in Love's Labour's Lost, and A Dream.

The first half of the next scene (IV.iii) reverts to the love-troubles of Phebe, whose letter is delivered by Silvius to Ganymede. Lodge narrated this episode straight after the first meeting of these three, but Shakespeare as usual prefers to tell his stories in smaller, intertwining episodes. He rearranges several details of the letter and its reception. In place of a long letter,

with a sonnetto as postscript (II.239-241), Phebe sends verses only and fewer. Moreover the text is withheld from us until Silvius has delivered it, and Rosalind has commented scornfully once more: Lodge gave the full text of the letter at the time Phoebe penned it, and Rosalynde does not begin to tease until some time after Montanus has handed it over. Whereas Rosalynde teases Montanus, Rosalind keeps most of her scorn for Phebe (who can better stand it than the "tame snake" Silvius, IV.iii.70). Although Rosalynde's language becomes quite lively in teasing reproof (II.242) Shakespeare uses none of it.

The second half of the scene is in a different vein, marked by a transition to rather formal verse, as Oliver, last seen in III.i, arrives in Arden and narrates how his brother rescued him. Because Shakespeare is not going to lay much stress on the eldest brother and his wooing, though Lodge had given all the courtships roughly equal attention, Oliver's arrival, and still more the news (V.ii) that he and Celia have an understanding, suggest an acceleration of pace towards the finale. The essentials of the present scene are taken from Lodge: Oliver's haggard condition, his sleep, the lion watching, Orlando's arrival and hesitation, the rescue and reconciliation. Yet alteration, omission and expansion make crucial differences of effect. Economically Shakespeare avoids having to present Orlando in yet another fight, and stage a wild animal or replace it by a brigand, and creates instead the chance for Oliver to show his penitence and meet Celia. Omissions

are as noticeable as alterations. Rosader's long meditation—whether to let his brother die—is prudently reduced to a single sentence (IV.iii.126-131). Similarly Oliver recognizes his brother at once upon awaking, unlike Saladyne, and three lines suffice to convey their recognition and reconciliation (lines 138-140), which occupy as many pages in the novel (II.218-220). Shakespeare adds the cunning touch that Oliver conceals his identity from the girls until at the climax of the narrative he says "I awaked": the revelation creates an exchange in which he can show them his penitence. There are additions of greater significance however. The danger to Oliver comes not only from the lioness (its sex is changed) but from a snake which has coiled round his neck. In fact though the rescue is not staged it is made curiously vivid by the verse set-piece, and especially by Shakespeare's two beasts. Each beast is more pictorially described than Lodge's single hungry lion (II.215), in fact they are partly emblems: the snake is Oliver's own deceit, the lioness in milk is the family loyalty and dangerous spirit of Orlando, which he must overcome in himself before rescuing his brother. The additions at the close of Oliver's narrative are also notable. To heighten admiration of the hero's bravery and of course to explain his absence, his wound is made serious enough to make him faint: courteous as ever, he sends Oliver to make his apologies. To increase evidence of the heroine's capacity for feeling she is made to swoon in sympathy; but as this swoon is on stage Shakespeare enjoys presenting her embarrassment at so failing in her masculine

role—all she can do is to squeak that the swoon too was counterfeit, which no one believes. He achieves the sort of dual effect we noticed in Errors: her discomfort is serious but our reception of it includes amusement, not least when Oliver bids her "counterfeit to be a man" (IV.iii.171). It is the nearest this heroine—unlike Julia or Viola—comes to experiencing the painful as well as humorous potentialities of disguise: he may have been prompted by the romance genre or his own earlier romance, though Rosalynde does go so far as to weep for Rosader's pain and give him a soothing draught (II.224). The prolonged playful exploitation of the ironies of sex-disguise begins from Lodge but is developed enormously.

After the pastoral and romantic courtships of IV.iii Shakespeare reverts to Touchstone and Audrey for low-life contrast. This time the third party is not Martext, but William: here is a triangular situation to recall and contrast with the triangle centred on Phebe. The juxtapositions continue in the following scene (V.ii), in which the latter triangle reappears with the addition of Orlando, to make a quartet: as often Touchstone does not appear when Silvius does. In the scene after that we are back again with Audrey and the Fool (V.iii.1 ff), but its main purpose is to present the song: there has been no song since IV.ii and this is the last opportunity before the finale.

V.ii, framed by the Touchstone scenes, includes material gathered from several places in Rosalynde. Its first forty lines

narrate the sudden love of Oliver and Celia. Shakespeare saves time by not presenting it directly (and by omitting Saladyne's rescue of Alinda from "certaine Rascalls", II.222). He also treats it in an amused way, glorying in its whirlwind brevity rather than apologizing for it: Orlando, and even more Rosalind, laugh wonderingly. There is little specific debt to Lodge, who keeps to the convention that love is as sudden as the description of it is slow; but as Alinda does in fact accede to Saladyne's wooing sooner than the other two ladies Shakespeare may be pointing up this comparative rapidity. Oliver curiously pauses to mention that "Aliena" is poor (V.ii.6)--a detail more worthy of the calculating motivation of the novel--but it is placed so as to lead to the conclusion that he will "live and die a shepherd". This, his grand gesture, is amusingly like some of Orlando's over-conventional postures in Acts II and III and scarcely to be taken seriously. What is to be taken seriously is Orlando's sad reflection, "how bitter a thing it is to look into happiness through another man's eyes" (V.ii.41), and Rosalind responds, with her proven capacity for sympathy: it is Orlando's regret which ushers in her plan for a double or rather multiple wedding. The sequence of feelings is borrowed from Lodge but deepened.

Though the promises of happiness by means of magic are also from the novel, the details again differ. In Lodge the heroine's source of magical aid is a friend, who is to bring in

Rosalynde, but in the play Rosalind has "convers'd with a magician" and will herself be the conjurer. Shakespeare lays more stress on the belief necessary in Orlando if her magic is to succeed--perhaps building on Lodge's passing mention, "uppon that take the faith of a young Shepheard" (II.246).¹

Having thus prepared one half of the resolution Rosalind now prepares the other half, that which concerns Phebe, as Lodge had done though in the contrary order (II.245). Shakespeare's four-way exchanges are more patterned than Lodge's here. Lodge narrates simply that Phoebe promises to love Montanus if ever she abandons loving Ganymede, while Rosalynde for her part promises to love no woman but her: after which the solution is plain enough, given the fact of sex-disguise. Shakespeare builds his scene up to a final speech by Rosalind making the same promises (and repeating her promise to Orlando); but first he presents a hymn to love in four parts, one speaker following another. This is more formal than Lodge; on the other hand Rosalind--speaking last of the four each time--makes deliberately asymmetrical contributions, which make the effect complex and witty, by contrasts within the passage and with the pastoral monotone of Lodge:

<u>Phebe</u> :	Good Shepherd, tell this youth what 'tis to love.
<u>Silvius</u> :	It is to be all made of sighs and tears; And so am I for Phebe.
<u>Phebe</u> :	And I for Ganymede.
<u>Orlando</u> :	And I for Rosalind.
<u>Rosalind</u> :	And I for no woman. (V.ii.76-81)

¹ The insistence on faith, or belief, in the power of art is emphasized in similar scenes elsewhere in Shakespeare (MND, V.i, MA V.i and iv, WT V.iii), as also the wonder which is to attend the fulfilment of faith.

The praise of love, and the whole exchange, pick up words and even phrases from various passages in the novel: all are conventional, but now that becomes part of the point, emphasized by Rosalind's salty departures from convention.

The finale is brisk, yet involves most of the characters--more, certainly, than in Lodge. Shakespeare omits Lodge's preliminaries (II.246-251), which centre on Coridon and on further sonnets of Montanus read aloud to Gerismond. He substitutes a few words between Orlando and the Duke, who, since he has not been seen since II.vii, must have his status briefly re-established. Then Rosalind once more extracts promises from the other three lovers and herself, and gains also the Duke's consent. Lodge (II.252) had included a similar recapitulation of promises, but because Gerismond offered Rosader his daughter unprompted by her, Shakespeare's change stresses yet again Rosalind's initiative. After she and Celia have gone off to change into bridal costume, to allow them time Shakespeare brings in more characters to the finale, more sacks to the mill of marriage--Touchstone and Audrey, who are to be married with the other couples. Shakespeare adds a recognition that marriage, like need (II.vii), is common to all conditions of people; and a delightful absence of social divisiveness is implied by the fact that Rosalind will share her wedding with Audrey and her odd groom. The Fool amuses the Duke and company by a series of setpiece fooleries, until the climactic stage direction: "Enter Hymen, Rosalind and Celia. Still music." Deity and music commonly accompany moments of solemn ceremony

in Shakespeare. Neither is suggested by Lodge, who throws away the climax since Rosalynde enters as bride, and tells her father all, in a single sentence. More time is given to Montanus' reactions, as in the whole climax, and to Saladyne's jealousy of Rosader's luck. These are well omitted in the play, although a revelation that "Aliena" is Celia may be missed. Lodge again spends more time describing the feast after the wedding than the wedding itself (II.253-255): Coridon's song at the feast disappears in favour of the song in Hymen's honour which concludes the masque-like wedding. The middle brother now makes his sole appearance, just as in the novel (V.iv.145 ff., II.255), to recall attention to the usurper, initiating changes which will take all the main actors back from Arden to a purified court. But of course he announces repentance concluded, not a battle yet to be fought; and the rest of the finale, with Jaques (his asperities not even yet silenced) formally dispensing appropriate bounties to the main participants, is not based on Lodge. One negative feature however may be explained by reference to the novel. Adam never reappears, even in the First Folio head-notes, but neither did Adam Spencer except in Lodge's very last sentence, as if he remembered his existence only just in time. Shakespeare's Epilogue, by Rosalind, does not follow Lodge's final paragraph, which points a moral and reverts to Euphues. Instead he gradually takes us out of the play world, while recalling the importance of "conjuring" to the theatre as to stage magicians, in a manner strongly recalling the Epilogue to A Dream.

If we may attempt a summary of the main tendencies within the selections and alterations recorded in the preceding pages, before passing on to consider Shakespeare's verbal debts to Rosalynde, it must be with the proviso that the full effect of Shakespeare's source-use is best seen at the level of the particular: generalizations here are a blunt instrument of appreciation, though they may have some value of their own, especially in regard to generic considerations.

The paramount impression one derives from systematically comparing As You Like It with Rosalynde is of course that Shakespeare was helped enormously by the novel. The debt is both quantitative and qualitative, for not only incidents are taken over but a variety of other elements. To name but a few the pastoral landscape and colouring; the antithesis between a denaturing court and the greater tranquillity of Arden, which governs both narrative shape and themes; the parallelism of the three love-stories, already developed and (to some extent) diversified in the novel; and of course the variety and groupings of characters. Nevertheless in resuming the manner and effects of Shakespeare's reordering, reducing and extending of the source-material, we must stress his radical difference of treatment, even though in few other comedies of Shakespeare is so much material taken over to undergo metamorphosis.

Shakespeare's most obvious omissions concern pace, tone and motivation. The extremely leisurely pace of the novel is abandoned for Shakespeare's normal brisk opening sequence; and though

the emphasis on adventure and physical danger decreases once Arden is attained (Shakespeare in fact diminishes even what there was of adventure in the later part of the novel), there is no slackening in the nexus of emotional and intellectual happenings. Tone and motivation in Rosalynde are euphuistic, their chief characteristics being a balancing elegance of surface and an underlying extremism. Shakespeare's play has a different elegance, and rarely goes to extremes of language or emotion: when it does do so, it is to place and ridicule the extremes, so that for instance the courtships of those whose loving conforms to stereotype is felt as affectation. Characterization accordingly is at once more consistent and more humane: instead of oscillating between prudential calculation and strained magnanimity, Shakespeare's characters behave altogether more naturally, so that, for example, Rosalind rather than Celia takes initiatives, except in I.iii, where she is temporarily down-cast, and does so from a more understandable combination of motives, namely mischievous gaiety and ready sympathy (e.g. V.ii, see discussion above).

Elsewhere alteration rather than omission is most noticeable. Tact and sens are often being enhanced simultaneously, as when the youngest son's legacy is made less, instead of more, substantial than the elder brother's: just because Oliver's jealousy is less justifiable than Saladyne's it is more unstable and threatening. More important, the stress falls on Orlando's more appalling, less material deprivation, namely his lack of proper breeding; and

because manners, education and civility are aspects of humane relationship, the first scene is made to contribute to the theme of man's relationship to man. Examples could be multiplied of ways in which slight alterations improve local dramatic effect or moral coherence, and contribute also to the overall thematic harmonies.

The same is true of another widespread type of alteration, by which the long setpiece speeches of the novel are broken up into short exchanges. The effect is of course more dramatic, especially in the case of quarrels and arguments. These alterations are paralleled in the way Shakespeare constructs on the larger scale: he tends to keep all his plots moving at once, by means of scenes for the various groups of characters in turn, so that no group is forgotten for long. Other purposes however are also being served by this procedure; for instance the passage of time can be suggested by the absence of characters for a scene or two. Yet a more significant, indeed controlling purpose is served whenever the alternations of character-groups produce a revealing, especially an ironic, juxtaposition. Such effects are sometimes found in the novel, as when the static pageant of Montanus' love is offset against the livelier loves of Rosalynde and Alinda; but the effect is far clearer in the play and has a more intellectual thrust. Much of the ironic edge and richness of variety comes from Shakespeare's insertion of new characters and relationships, especially the realism contributed by the unpastoral country-dwellers, Audrey, William and Sir Oliver, and the detachment and acerbity contributed by Touchstone and Jaques respectively. All these comprise a strong counterweight to the type-characters of romance and pastoral, to whom the novel is limited, for the basic

pastoral-romantic situation is being seen from many more points of view; yet the added characters by no means annihilate the inherited ones, nor do they win all the arguments. The essential tolerance of pastoral is in fact more fully vindicated in the play because it proves able to accommodate even its critics.¹

These last types of alteration amount in fact to a different relation of the play and the novel to their common genre. Whereas the novel stays within the situations and assumptions of pastoral romance the play moves outside them. What we find is not only use of the genre, but independence of it; and not only independence but a critique. It is easier however to see the point concerning pastoral, which characters like the Duke and Corin, Touchstone and Jaques, overtly praise or criticize, than concerning romance; and yet a considerable part of Orlando's behaviour and almost all of the reformed Oliver's are a shrewd though good-humoured exposure of the absurd hyperboles and freaks of conventional romance. Rosalind, liberated by the equally conventional impenetrability of disguise, provides an explicit commentary on these absurdities (IV.i). Thus Shakespeare is able simultaneously to use and expose, satirize and accept; to celebrate the ideal and the actual, what his genre suggests and what it omits; so that precisely where the play follows the novel most closely, as in the scenes for the disguised Rosalind, it is also most different from the novel in its total effect.

¹Formally too this is true. Some diversity of styles is found in the novel, which of course modulates from prose to verse and song on many occasions, and into French and Latin at times; yet in the play the diversity of styles is not only wider but more in accord with the diversity of social positions and personal temperaments (hence Jaques' disdain for blank verse at IV.i.29).

The verbal texture of As You Like It owes more to Rosalynde than earlier comedies of Shakespeare to their sources, as one would expect of a play so close in other respects to its source. Yet it shows the same tendencies as the earlier plays towards transposition and clustering of correspondences, as well as the recurrences in corresponding episodes which we should expect. Closely as he follows the novel there is nothing like the process by which North's Plutarch gave him, for instance, the language of Enobarbus' speech about Cleopatra in her barge. Nevertheless it is worth following the more unsystematic verbal indebtedness of our play in the detail which its extent deserves. The order of Shakespeare's scenes is followed, except when transposition and other factors suggest a different order.

The title itself is changed from "Rosalynde" to "As You Like It" in accordance with the common Elizabethan, and especially Shakespearean, habit of naming comedies (seldom tragedies) to suggest an atmosphere or theme rather than to name their chief character. But this title, as often a catchphrase, probably comes from Lodge's preliminary matter: to the "Gentlemen Readers" he says "If you like it, so" (II.160). The derivation is the more likely because the same passage contains two words which occur in other parts of the play—"curtleaxe" (II.159, cf. I.iii.113) and "countercheckt" (II.160, cf. V.iv.75 and 90). Thus although some passages of Shakespeare gather words from different places in the novel, words occurring together in Lodge may be scattered over

different parts of the play, both processes being probably unconscious. The early stages of the narrative proper yield few correspondences, no doubt because the play begins only after Sir Rowland is dead and Orlando grown up; but we do notice a phrase from Sir John's dying speech, "let time be touchstone of friendship" (II.162). The Fool is a touchstone, or exemplar, of friendship in that "he'll go along o'er the wide world" with Celia (I.iii.128), but usually he is a detached tester of the places and people he meets and comments on: a touchstone, in a different way, of other qualities.

In the first episode where play and novel do run alongside, Shakespeare's language absorbs several words from the corresponding passage in Lodge. Both writers contrast the "nature" which makes the hero a "gentleman" with the bad nurture that makes him like a "peasant" (II.166 and I.i.9-20 and 60-67). The first scene of the play also recalls the much later passage where Saladyne confesses that he kept Rosader as one of his "servile hindes" (II.219):¹ this too is gathered into Orlando's recital of distress (I.i.18). Together the references to "peasants" and "hinds" and a "gentle nature" oppressed by bad breeding seem to have aroused associations with the Prodigal Son, who also demeaned his birth by living with hinds and hogs:² since he deserved it but Orlando has not, the seemingly irrelevant association is made

¹This passage has another "countercheck" in it.

²"Prodigall" is found at II.161 (Sir John's "Legacie"), and II.232.

expressive (I.i.32-35). The antithesis of gentle birth and peasantlike breeding is therefore derived from Lodge but somewhat extended. Shakespeare also turns Lodge's "thought to shake him out of his dumps" (II.167) into "thou shalt hear how he will shake me up" (line 25).

Until III.ii there are few more correspondences, but in that scene there are suddenly several. Some are commonplaces of pastoral or Petrarchan love-poetry, deriving from the genre rather than Lodge; but even if they happened to come from the novel, they lack specific interest. Such are the correspondences we noticed in the rhymed verses of Orlando's first speech ("chaste", "virtue", "fair"). But sometimes Shakespeare takes a conventional phrase from Lodge and gives it new life, sardonic or fresh. So Rosader declares his lady "a rose without prickles" (II.201) but Touchstone gives this an equivocal twist, while keeping the play on her name:

He that sweetest rose will find
Must find love's prick and Rosalinde.
(III.ii.101-102)

On the other hand Shakespeare gives the unremarkable "Synode" of Rosalynde's soliloquy (II.204) fresh beauty in Orlando's last, and best, poem:

Thus Rosalinde of many parts
By heavenly synod was devis'd,
Of many faces, eyes and hearts,
To have the touches dearest priz'd.
(lines 139-142)

Two subsequent parallels are probably generic as well, but to

euphuistic writing or Elizabethan parlance rather than pastoral. Lodge mentions "love", "whip" and "counsel" together in the "Schedule" (Greg, p.xxx; not printed in Bullough), and so does Shakespeare (lines 368-372); both in quipping conceited vein. Soon afterwards Rosalind says "as boys and women are for the most part cattle of this colour" (lines 381-382),¹ recalling a different passage in the novel where Rosalynde says "You may see...what mad cattell you women be..." (II.131). Lodge's phrase is striking enough to be recalled, and Shakespeare may echo his talk of madness here. The bewildering way in which Lodge's phrases emerge from Shakespeare's memory in new groupings is shown when he echoes another striking phrase from this page of Rosalynde, but after Rosalind's next encounter with Orlando: "if your robes were off, what mettall are you made of that you are so satyricall against women? Is it not a foule bird defiles the owne nest?" becomes "We must have your doublet and hose pluck'd over your head, and show the world what the bird hath done to her own nest" (IV.i.180-183). The ideas of stripping and revelation of self-defilement are more closely juxtaposed by Shakespeare.

The next scene with notable correspondences is III.v. It involves Silvius and Phebe, and as these two characters are closer to Lodge's pastoral tone than the others it is natural that their scenes absorb more generic language. Yet where there

¹"Colours" occurs in the earlier passage (Greg, p.xxx).

is generic borrowing there is sometimes also specific borrowing. Thus Silvius echoes Montanus in calling himself "humble" before the "scorn" of his "tyrant" (II.230, III.v.5; II.230, III.v.1; II.229, III.v.14), though these are the sort of thing a literary lover must say to his mistress. An example of more specific indebtedness, which makes a tame original into a vivid phrase, is the transposition of Phoebe's words to Montanus "Well sir, if your market may be made no where els, home again, for your Mart is at the fairest" (II.231). In the comedy this comes towards the climax of Ganymede's rebuke of Phebe, for scorning Silvius, as "Sell when you can; you are not for all markets" (line 60). The change of speaker, and the negation of the metaphor, alter mild self-praise into stinging reproof. The following scene has few correspondences besides the one already noted (IV.i.183) and none so specific.

There are few parallels until the next scene involving Silvius and Phebe (V.ii.69 ff) but then there are a number. The four-part praise of love is full of generic words which occur, not at the corresponding passage in Lodge, but towards the end of the first exchanges between Montanus and Phoebe (II.230-231): "sighs", "tears" (V.ii.77), "faith" and "service" (line 82), "passion" (line 83), "duty" (line 89), "humbleness" and "patience" (line 90). But the words with which Rosalind interrupts the litany, which is indeed becoming monotonous, are also based on Lodge: Shakespeare

transposes the words of Rosalynde to Montanus "in courting Phoebe thou barkest with the Wolves of Syria against the Moone" (II.242) into her gay dismissal of all three lovers "Pray you, no more of this; 'tis like the howling of Irish wolves against the moon" (lines 102-103). Her point is the same, the lugubrious, repetitive futility of the wolves, but by changing barking to howling and Syrian to Irish the phrase is made a more caustic interruption. The same exchange between Montanus and Phoebe may also have suggested a line of the song in V.iii, for "love is crowned with the prime" (line 30) recalls Rosalynde's rebuke "then are they hated in the winter, that might have been loved in the prime" (II.232). The finale provides a last example of transposition. Ganimede's promise to "bring in Rosalynde" (II.246) does not appear where the promise is first made (V.ii), but where the promise is repeated:

You say, if I bring in your Rosalind,
You will bestow her on Orlando here?
(V.iv.6-7)

Evidently therefore Shakespeare did not refer to the text of Rosalynde during the composition of his play in any systematic way, and perhaps did not consult it then at all.¹ The number of correspondences suggests that the verbal texture of the novel impressed itself on his memory, but in a subconscious way that made its reappearance in his play unpredictable. Yet the haphazard nature of the correspondences reveals, more clearly than the remoter sources of other comedies, his tendency to remember vivid phrases

¹He could have read the novel at any time after 1590, and could have read it more than once. Its influence might yet be found in plays before AYL, as happens with Brooke's Romeus and Juliet in TGV.

and particular sequences of the novel, transmuting and above all transposing.

Nomenclature too depends on that of the main source to an extent unusual in the comedies. In The Two Gentlemen only one name recurred from Diana ("Valerius") and in The Merchant, though Shakespeare follows the Bond-story in Il Pecorone quite closely, he uses none of its names except for "Belmont". From Rosalynde however come "Rosalind", "Ganymede", "Aliena", "Phebe", "Adam", "Corin" and of course "Arden". It is indeed unusual for Shakespeare to retain the name of the chief character, but easy to see why he liked the sound of "Rosalind" and its associations with the "rose", traditional symbol of love in religious, courtly and ballad traditions.¹ "Ganymede" as disguise-name is also well retained: the page of Jove, a Cupid-like, mischievous figure, is appropriate to the sprightly heroine, but Shakespeare points up the aptness more than Lodge (I.iii.120-121). "Aliena" too is well retained. Its meaning is suggested, though more vaguely: "Something that hath a reference to my state" (line 123), that is, "not her own" (Latin alienus) or "not herself"--in current parlance "alienated". "Phebe" is a common enough name for a pastoral nymph and its connections with the moon-goddess and chastity are conventionally suitable (or suitably conventional). The choice of "Adam" however is less conventional. This character begins life in Gamelyn as "Adam the spencer" and becomes "Adam Spencer" in Lodge: so plain "Adam" is a reversion, probably because Shakespeare liked the

¹ The name occurs also in RJ and LLL in the form "Rosaline", which may support the idea that it was a favourite, and/or that Shakespeare had read Rosalynde early in the 1590s.

sense of "typical man". Corin the character corresponds to Lodge's Coridon, and Shakespeare may have abbreviated "Coridon" because "Corin" sounds less Greek, though still conventionally pastoral; or more robust. But he may have had Spenser's "Colin" at the back of his mind, or the "Corin" of Clyomon and Clamvdes.¹ Finally the name of the forest, "Arden" or the "Ardennes" is taken over, but as with "Coridon" it is made to sound English as well as romantically foreign: there was an Arden in Warwickshire, and the association harmonizes with the English balladry added by Shakespeare.

These borrowed names as a group are rather various in evocation--French, Latin, Greek (pastoral or mythological) and English, which may perhaps have been the intended effect. Invented names, or names chosen from other sources than Lodge, show a similar range, being suitable to French romance, or pastoral, or the English countryside. "Oliver", "Sir Rowland" and "Orlando" (the Italian form of "Roland") recall the knights of Charlemagne and the great days of French chivalry. Here Shakespeare is extending a hint in Rosalynde, where we hear a little about "the twelve Peeres of France" and the "Chevalrie" of the court (II.169). Other names are French, but not necessarily Carolingian: "Charles", "Amiens", "Dennis", "De Boys", and "Jaques". They share the Frenchness of Lodge's names but the particular names are all different. The pastoral names "Celia" and "Silvius" blend well with

¹Bullough, (II.155-157) thinks that the character as well as the name may be based on the old romance, which of course includes a disguised heroine; but Corin seems closer to Lodge's Coridon than to the ribald rustic of Clyomon.

those taken from Lodge, and perhaps it is no accident that both are found in Diana. "Celia", connoting Diana and chastity, is apposite though colour-less: perhaps "Alinda" was too like "Rosalinda" and "Aliena" to be retained. "Silvius", connoting the woods rather than the mountains of his counterpart "Montanus", also seems a slight improvement. English names are "Audrey", "William", "Martext" and "Touchstone". The first two are deliberately ordinary Christian names. The last two are the sort of names we meet in plays which have a low-life sub-plot, of a piece with "Dull", "Bottom", "Dogberry" and "Aguecheek". In other words they declare their significance plainly: the hedge-priest is a bad preacher who confuses the text he expounds, and the clown's name in the forest bespeaks his function there, to comment and test. We might have expected more such names in the play if its sub-plot had not depended more on Lodge's precious couple than on the low-life couple Audrey and William.

Some names however are not simply French or English, but both at once. "Arden" is one example, "Oliver"—the name alike of the romance character and the shabby priest—is another. "Jaques", name of the third brother and the topical English melancholic traveller, was an English name as well as French and so was "De Boys".¹ Even "Orlando" was becoming an English forename—cf. Orlando Gibbons (b.1583). But "Orlando", perhaps substituted for "Rosader" because

¹Which further recalls the woods ("bois") and Robin Hood/Wood.

that was too like "Rosalind", has so many connotations that it is not possible to say which prompted the choice and which were its results. "Orlando" could connote a chivalric or pastoral hero, or even a figure of burlesque as in some scenes of Greene's Orlando. At all events the nomenclature not only suggests a French pastoral world and native rusticity but blends them, doing in little what the play does as a whole.

Because Shakespeare drew so much on Rosalynde his own earlier work is not the sole source of many ideas. On the other hand he may have chosen this novel as main source because it contained elements he had used before and wished to use again. At any rate we are entitled to relate the repetitions, or new variations, of old interests to his previous ventures, and particularly so for that favourite of romance, the heroine disguised as a boy, in whom her lover confides without recognizing her. As You Like It repeats the motif of The Two Gentlemen and The Merchant, but with variations. The Merchant has three disguised ladies but only Jessica disguises in pursuit of love and none of the disguises leads to wooing complications. The one disguise in The Two Gentlemen takes Julia in pursuit of her love, but it neither causes nor resolves wooing complications. Rosalind therefore breaks ground new to Shakespeare (though not to Lodge). She disguises to escape like Jessica; and to pursue her love—but only after escaping. More important, her disguise causes the complication of Phebe's mistaken passion for a woman: for the first time Shakespeare makes disguise the cause

rather than the accompaniment of unrequited love. It is simple too to arrange that the recognition of Ganymede as a woman will impel Phebe to accept Silvius: he would have been unrequited if Ganymede had not appeared, but her appearance, in spite of distracting Phebe at first, eventually requites him. All this pattern was in the source, but evidently Shakespeare found it pleasing since he repeats it in his next comedy, with further variations within repetition. Orsino has to change his love, unlike Silvius: Olivia does not revert from Cesario to Orsino as Phebe does from Ganymede to Silvius, but is provided with an equivalent to Cesario. A smaller, more specific debt to earlier comedies is the heroine's swoon, and its pathos: these were used in The Two Gentlemen, added there also by Shakespeare to his source. But whereas Julia was pathetic before her swoon, Rosalind's is the first indication that she is vulnerable. Usually the playfulness and high spirits of the disguised Rosalind are stressed more than this vulnerability. On the other hand between pathos and playfulness lies a mood which combines play with self-discovery: "In each game of wit there is the shock of a new depth in an increasingly complex nature discovering itself",¹ so that by a paradox the adoption of conventional disguise makes Rosalind more free than those who do not disguise. Her achievement of self-knowledge in love, by means of disguise, is a major achievement of As You Like It. Her use of language to hide and reveal love simultaneously has some

¹M.C. Bradbrook, The Growth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy, p.100.

relation to the self-deceit of Beatrice and Benedick,¹ but their mental disguise does not yield the ironic combination of gay surface with deep feeling growing into self-awareness which we recognize in the "curing" of Orlando by Ganymede:

Orlando: Fair youth, I would I could make thee believe I love.

Rosalind: Me believe it! You may as soon make her that you love believe it; which, I warrant, she is apter to do than to confess she does.
(III.ii.356-358)

Moreover the growth to self-knowledge in Rosalind² reflects and reinforces a more general thematic interest in self-knowledge: Orlando (III.ii.263), and the Duke (II.i.10-11) are also concerned to know themselves. There are still figures who, as in Love's Labour's Lost, exhibit those opposites of self-knowledge, affectation and ignorance (for example Phebe, III.v.57, and Jaques, II.vii.64); but As You Like It goes further than its predecessors towards defining self-knowledge positively. In fact there are anticipations of the play where self-knowledge receives its most complete exploration, King Lear: not only in the plot, in the divided families and divided kingdom, and the flight from court to country, but also in the governing ideas, in the theme of self-discovery and the endorsement of the elements' harsh truthfulness in preference to the court's insincerity.

This theme of self-knowledge and the inquiry into pastoral are two organizing centres of the play, round which a great variety

¹ AYL shares the interest in self-knowledge with LLL and MA particularly.

² Emphasized by the contrasting awkwardness of her first meeting with Orlando, at court.

of characters and attitudes are deployed in juxtaposition and ironic contrast: another is the spectrum of attitudes towards romantic love, and here too it may be that earlier comedies supplied some starting-points. In The Two Gentlemen the minor characters whom Shakespeare adds to his source-materials diversify our response to the romantic protagonists in love: Launce, the clown, burlesques his master's love by his own absurd love¹ (III.i.261 ff) and Speed, the pert Ilyyan page, mocks the love-induced obtuseness of his master (II.i, passim). Burlesque is present too in Errors (Dromio and the fat kitchen-wench), Love's Labour's Lost (Jaquenetta and her diversified suitors), A Dream (the mechanicals' representation of love) and The Merchant (Launcelot Gobbo's misdeeds, III.v.32-37). So in As You Like It the fool refers to a past amour in a context burlesquing the more elevated orthodoxy of Silvius' passion, which has occasioned his reference to Jane Smile (II.iv.43-52). Yet Touchstone's capacity for a commentary which places what it burlesques is now developed a good deal further, into his bizarrely ridiculous courtship of Audrey,² which nevertheless culminates in a wedding, and one moreover which the couple share with the high-life couples. Seldom does Shakespeare align burlesque and the burlesqued so closely, since although the Jaquenetta plot is equally fully developed it remains more separate (although the comparison indicates that As You Like It may owe a particular debt to the ideas

¹His "secrecy" concerning the identity of his beloved parodies the secrecy enjoined upon the conventional courtly lover.

²The low-life mistress presented actually on stage, as only Jaquenetta previously is.

and methods of Love's Labour's Lost). Meanwhile the mockery of love which Speed voiced follows a more winding path, since it is often absent and when present tends to take the more subtle form of self-mockery, in Berowne, Benedick and Beatrice. Once more As You Like It brings different developments together and extends them: not only is there a return to occupational mockery in the role of Jaques, but self-mockery is extended, since Rosalind through her disguise is both the scorner of love, like Beatrice, and steadfast in love, like Hero. Above all because the courtship of Rosalind and Orlando is carried on under the mocking guise of a make-believe wooing, the romantic courtship has absorbed burlesque and mockery into itself, and the two are one. Hence too the play's power to combine a romantic wedding with the low-life relationship of Audrey and Touchstone: no damage is done to the underlying seriousness of the central love-exploration because it contains and orders ironic criticism within itself (just as Touchstone's burlesque is felt as extreme and limited in force because it is balanced on the other side by the highfalutin extremism of the purely pastoral couple, Silvius and Phebe).

Juxtaposition and ironic contrast, then, have been extended by Shakespeare from the material of his story-source, partly with help from his own earlier comedies. In doing so he was not doing something he had not done before, because he was exploiting opportunities presented by pastoral and romance alike; but he was exploiting them to an unusual degree. The nearest he had come

before in this direction was in Love's Labour's Lost, whose setting, also Franco-English, relates closely to As You Like It. In As You Like It however "the art of comic juxtaposition is at its subtlest. It is to give it fullest scope that the action can be pushed up into a corner, and the usual entanglements of plotting, though not dispensed with altogether, can be loosened" (H. Jenkins, "As You Like It", p.43). As a result it is the comedy of Shakespeare where we are most aware of his intelligence and understanding: he is critical but also sympathetic towards the people and attitudes he ranges around his governing themes. Above all this play of mind does not preclude feeling--in Rosalind, especially, but also in Orlando and the Duke--whereas in Love's Labour's Lost feeling is a little overshadowed by linguistic virtuosity, in Shakespeare himself as well as Berowne or Rosaline.¹ On the other hand so much juxtaposition and intellectual comparing produces at times a sense of inactivity² which, appropriate though it is to dwellers in Arden as in Navarre, marks out As You Like It and Love's Labour's Lost as exceptions among the comedies. It is possible to feel that if the comparative inactivity of As You Like It became usual in Shakespeare's comedies we might miss the hum of comic intrigue and the muddle of comic mistake. But Shakespeare may himself have felt so, for as Jenkins (p.40) says, "In As You Like It, I suggest, Shakespeare took his comedy in one direction nearly as far as it

¹ See G.K. Hunter, John Lyly, pp.343-3450

² Our comparison of story-source with AYL emphasizes the degree to which Shakespeare has in fact articulated the story-line; but that is another reason why the comparison of AYL with Shakespeare's own earlier work is also needed.

could go. And then, as occasionally happens in Shakespeare's career, when he has developed his art far in one direction, in the comedy which succeeds he seems to readjust his course." His next comedy was Twelfth Night, in which although there is a well-organized and intelligent diversity one is aware too of lively intrigue and comic mistake. Twelfth Night is different in its source-relationships as well, for it has multiple sources within a story-tradition that includes fewer narrative than dramatic versions. The two differences may in fact be connected, that is, intrigue and mistake may bulk larger because a reaction from the pattern of As You Like It and a perception of fertile sources confirmed each other. Certainty in the matter is quite impossible, but the differences are so pronounced as to make such an explanation attractive.

CHAPTER TEN

TWELFTH NIGHT: COMBINATION AND RECAPITULATION

AND THE MATURING OF ROMANCE

Twelfth Night¹ is in some ways the best of our group of comedies, since whether one considers its treatment of story-materials, genres or Shakespeare's own earlier work, it is plain that his combination of varied ingredients produces an extraordinary effect of unity--a unity moreover which is present at the levels of event, language and theme alike. The play's success is owed in part, but only in part, to a judicious blending of genres, which is both a continuation and a new departure in relation to earlier comedies. First Twelfth Night is evidently a reversion from the combination of romance with pastoral which shapes As You Like It to a combination of romance with intrigue which recalls Errors. Yet the festive tradition of As You Like It and other comedies also contributes; and moreover the

¹For the chronology adopted, and the view taken as to the sources of TN, see Cap.1. Source-texts are referred to in the following editions: Menaechmi in the Loeb edn. by P. Nixon, (Latin text and translation), II.363-487; Gl'Ingannati (in the Italian), Edinburgh, 1943, (no editor named); translated by Bullough, II.286-339; Bandello in the Italian in Matteo Bandello, Le Novelle, ed. G. Brognoligo, 5 vols., Bari, 1910-12, III.252-279 (translations in this case being my own); Montemayor's Diana in the edn. of J.M. Kennedy, cited in Cap.3 above; Riche's "Of Apolonius and Silla" in Bullough, II.344-363, this being more legible than Rich's Farewell to Military Profession (1581), ed. in facsimile by T.M. Cranfill, Austin, Texas, 1959, which I have used for other parts of Riche's collection. I have not had access to any text of P. de Belleforest, Le Quatriesme tome des histoires tragiques, Turin, 1571 (Hist. 59) and have been obliged to rely on extracts printed in Rich's 'Apolonius & Silla', an Original of Shakespeare's Twelfth Night, ed. M. Luce, 1912, or in Luce's Arden edn., of TN, 1906. Secchi's plays Gl'Inganni and L'Interesse are referred to in Bullough's extracts, II.339-342 and II.343-344 respectively.

balance between romance and intrigue is not that of Errors, for whereas the methods of intrigue are preponderant in that play they are subordinate in Twelfth Night. Finally though this latter distinction between the two comedies may seem one of quantity, the new intensity of the romance elements and their influence on the meaning of Twelfth Night amounts to a qualitative distinction, making the play Shakespeare's most considered and mature treatment, to date, of romance. Hence it forms a climax in our chosen series of comedies. Accordingly the romance aspects of the play with which, to provide initial perspective, we begin are discussed at the level of type-plot and conventions of incident, but the profounder debt to romance is discussed only after the survey of contributory materials of whatever kind.

The typically romantic nature of the plot is recognizable in the fact that it treats primarily of love, and does so in terms which have many parallels in the romances: the unhappy because unrequited lover, who recalls many Petrarchan predecessors; the constant but unrequited heroine, whose patience like Griselda's is finally rewarded; the rival lady of higher rank who bemuses the lover without desiring his attentions, like Celia in Diana; and the complications and permutations through which the relations of these three evolve, before the normal happy ending of romance is attained. Moreover the device which at first complicates the action but finally resolves it is equally well-worn: the device of the heroine disguised as a boy, who is thus able to be with the man she

loves without being recognized.

That the romance convention is the frame within which the play moves, and that Shakespeare uses it consciously, is suggested by the way he uses two minor features of his type of plot. On the one hand he relies on the expectation that a disguised heroine will fall in love with her master (I.iv.40-41). On the other hand, while using the convention that the final recognitions are achieved by identification of birthmarks (V.i.234-235), he perhaps also treats humorously the convention on which he relies:¹ when the twins discover that the father of either of them "had a mole upon his brow", it is possible to feel that such evidence is circumstantial, trivial and, by this time in the proceedings, unnecessary.

Such typically romantic aspects of plot had never been exclusive to the romance forms of literature, for as early as Roman New Comedy they are found in dramatic forms whose dominant style is intrigue. Disguise in particular was employed by writers of romance and of intrigue drama almost equally, although the former were more likely than the latter to explore its meanings as well as presuppose its usefulness; and in its aspect of play, or role-playing, it extends also towards the disguises of festive tradition. Hence disguise is an agent of Shakespeare's harmonious combination of romance with intrigue and festivity. It will however be convenient to consider festivity and intrigue separately now, even though in the case of disguise there is some overlap with romance and with each other.

¹Cf. M. Doran, Endeavors of Art, pp.326-327.

The seasonal merry-making of festive tradition is implicit in the whole purpose of the play, as the title itself proclaims.¹ A pervasive spirit of revelry is suggested by the name of Feste; by that of Fabian, since in contemporary slang a "fabian" is a swash-buckler or roysterer; Andrew, since an "Andrew" is a clown, as in the phrase "merry Andrew"; and by the naming of their polar opposite Malvolio, the "illwill" or killjoy. The sub-plot indeed, consisting as it does of revelling which provokes the wrath of Malvolio, the humorous revenge which his rebukes in turn provoke, and the dual practical joke played upon Sir Andrew and Cesario, not merely contains festivity in its atmosphere but makes festivity its subject; and its subject not only in terms of event but in terms of a clash of attitudes to life. One of the play's indisputable values is the power to be happy, as the revellers can and Malvolio cannot. At the same time however revelry itself incurs criticism: the joke against Malvolio goes too far, the joke against Cesario recoils (tangibly) on the persons of Sir Andrew and Sir Toby. In short the assumption that there is a proper time and season for making merry mischief eventually reveals its corollary, that there is a time and a season to discontinue merry-making; a time for the players of roles--whether the role of steward or of reveller--to step down from their roles and be simply themselves. The play concludes with a paradoxical presentation of precisely this perception: the Fool, the festive entertainer, ends

¹ Some prompting in this direction could have come from Gl'Ingannati, which refers to Twelfth Night licence on two occasions (Bullough, II.287 in the Prologue and II.290), and also more generally to Carnival merry-making (II.307 and 319). The play was in fact performed at Carnival time in Siena (II.286 n.1).

the dramatic entertainment with a pleasing song, through which however he shows the potential disillusion and normal monotony of life, and the necessary end of festivity when *Twelfth Night* ends. At such a point the unconscious enjoyment of festivity has receded, though the festive figure still entertains us, to make way for serious perceptions of man's life in time: we approach the same sort of conception of self-knowledge as we approach by way of pastoral in *As You Like It*, and by way of romance in *Twelfth Night* itself, as I hope to show below.

Intrigue on the other hand is influential more in terms of method and device than of content and theme. Its characteristic forms include the scheming manipulation¹ of characters by other characters; and proliferating complications arising from the manipulations. These complications follow one another rapidly, within a setting normally in accordance with the dramatic unities. There is a tendency for fools to display, perhaps to flaunt, their stupidity: they are finally exposed and, it may be, purged of their folly. The value chiefly vindicated in the complication and the outcome is cleverness, the vindication of which implies in the play a world which men, rather than events or fate, control and in the audience an emotional detachment which allows them to admire this cleverness without asking awkward ethical questions. Similarly, though (or because) plot is complicated, the characters' appetites are simple, being limited for the most part to basic drives like sex and money;

¹Hence the emphasis on deceit in the title ("The Deceived Ones") and Prologue (Bullough, II.287) of *Gl'Ingannati*.

and the characters themselves are usually simple, conforming to a range of well-established types. Yet although these elements are found in dozens of comedies, they may not all occur together in a particular comedy: thus Menaechmi has no clever manipulator controlling the complications of plot, but gives that function to fate. Likewise follies may be exposed without being purged, or motivation may upon occasion go some way beyond blind appetite. Finally there were English fashions related to the broad tradition of intrigue, such as "humours" comedy (noticeable in The Merry Wives) and native variants of gulling.¹

In order to appreciate Shakespeare's use of intrigue in Twelfth Night it is particularly necessary to bear in mind the untypical as well as the typical forms, since even in The Merry Wives, where intrigue is most prominent, it is handled eclectically. In Twelfth Night, whose debt to romance is greater than that to intrigue, we can expect a still more eclectic treatment. Thus a number of intrigue characteristics are missing or only trivially present in the play: there is no vindication of clever scheming, and little detached admiration for it on the part of the audience; little or no suspension of ethical interest; the desire for money moves only Sir Toby and Feste, and the desire for sex is ignored; few of the characters are simple or to any large extent typical; and as in Menaechmi fate, not a central intriguer, controls what happens.

¹ See for example P. Mueschke and J. Fleisher, "Jonsonian Elements in the Comic Underplot of TN", in PMLA, XLVIII, 1933, pp.722-740.

It is true, too, that the sub-plot of Twelfth Night shows affinities with intrigue, insofar as its characters sometimes resemble type-characters—Sir Toby and Maria as clever manipulators, Malvolio and Sir Andrew as foolish lovers and gulls. The reason probably is that (as will be argued below) the sub-plot has been influenced by the Italian sources of the main plot. Yet apart from these particular influences and motifs like disguise which are not special to intrigue, the main affinities of the sub-plot characters—and of the sub-plot itself—are more with the festive tradition.

Intrigue influences should perhaps be sought less in the practical joking of the sub-plot than in the main plot; and less in terms of content than in the overall organization of plot and structure. It was in the latter respect that they influenced Errors most plainly, and in Twelfth Night too they give the action unity and momentum. The unity in question is not quite the strict classical unity of time and place, because days pass during the course of the action (II.iv.41), and months (V.i.88, 93), nor does the action take place entirely on the street. Nevertheless there are no significant changes of location or journeys, such as occur in As You Like It; and as for time we are more aware of the busy, breathless present than of any lapse of hours or months, once the plot against Malvolio and the mistakes of identity have begun. (Of time in another aspect however the romantic parts of the play do take account, as will be suggested in our conclusion). Momentum on the other hand

is provided by the mistakes, which take over the centre of action once the relations of Orsino, Olivia and Viola have been developed to a stalemate (III.iv). The mistakes occur because the female twin is taken to be a man, her brother is taken to be the man she seems to be, and she is taken to be the man her brother really is. From the mistakes which the twins occasion and the bewilderment they feel as well as cause, Shakespeare creates a pattern of confusions which intensifies the action to a climax of bewildered violence. The method, and some of the details, correspond to those of Errors, but are not such a large part of the whole play. Errors of feeling now have clear precedence over errors of identification.

A thematic as well as structural purpose is being served by the mistakes, again as in Errors, because the feelings of those who are absurdly confused are made important. We share their experience as they lose their equanimity, the most plangent instance being Antonio's "Do not tempt my misery..." (III.iv.332 ff.). A further serious purpose is the exposure of inadequacies under the stress of mistake, for example Orsino's lack of self-possession when in the finale he imagines himself betrayed. As with other comedies the mechanisms of intrigue are developed towards madness and wonder; but the gravity of Twelfth Night emerges from comparison with, say, A Dream because for Malvolio at least madness is thrust towards him without any eventual wonder to compensate.

The co-presence of intrigue with romance therefore is at times more than a matter of organization and supplementation: it is

a fruitful interaction, like that of festivity with romance which seems, but is not, limited to the "addition" of a sub-plot. Nevertheless since the cooperation of romance and intrigue, whether at a structural or a thematic level, is already present to some extent in the story which Shakespeare chooses to work up, its details are perhaps more properly examined in a survey of the main story-tradition. In what follows the tradition is briefly traced as far as Shakespeare, after which his selections and alterations are more fully expounded.

Twelfth Night stands in a story-tradition with two main divisions. The older division descends from Menaechmi, whose story of twin brothers who are mistaken for each other gave rise to Errors. In between these two comedies the tradition produced a variant in which one twin is a girl, the earliest play to use the variant being La Calandria of Bernardo Bibbiena (first performed in 1513).¹ La Calandria produced no offspring; but a very large progeny, resulted from the next known use of the variant, in the anonymous Gl'Ingannati (first performed in 1531). Here for the first time romantic complications are caused by the identical appearance of a brother and sister, and the sister serves her beloved as his page. The four main characters involved are the heroine disguised as a page; the man whom she loves and serves; the lady whom he loves unrequited and who loves the page unrequited; and the heroine's brother who by meeting the second lady resolves

¹Cf. M.T. Herrick, Italian Comedy in the Renaissance, pp.71-74.

the entanglement. These characters recur in almost all subsequent versions of the story, and for convenience will be called the Heroine, the Lover, the Lady and the Brother.

Gl'Ingannati naturally exhibits correspondences with its ancestor Menaechmi; thus the reason why the adventures of the female twin hold the stage in the first two acts, but are virtually eclipsed once her brother comes on in Act III, may be that her brother's role corresponds with that of Menaechmus the Traveller in Acts II and III of Plautus' comedy. His opportunistic manner of accepting a mistaken invitation certainly corresponds with the Traveller's.

On the other hand the differences between Gl'Ingannati and Menaechmi mark the beginning of a development in the tradition, of which Shakespeare's play is a culmination. The most important difference concerns the role of the heroine, Lelia. In place of the masculine world of Roman New Comedy, where women function like money-bags or dinners as objects of automatic appetite, the Italian play presents a world where women can be romantic and pathetic figures rather than viragos. Thus although Lelia does not remain at the centre of attention throughout the play its starting-point is her love for Flamminio and the disguise which she adopts in order to win him back. Again though the other women are usually absurd, as Lelia too sometimes is, there is some interest in her predicament of feeling: "Unfortunate me! Rejected, dismissed, fled from, hated! Why do I still pursue him who flees me? Why love him who hates me?" (II.vii, Bullough, II.310).

A good many dramatic versions were based on Gl'Ingannati, more or less closely, and included a play in Latin called Laelia which was performed at Queens' College, Cambridge, in 1595. Moore Smith's advocacy of Laelia¹ as a source for Twelfth Night has not won general acceptance, and in fact few of these plays bring the tradition any nearer to Shakespeare. The only ones which need be mentioned here are two plays of Nicolò Secchi, Gl'Inganni and L'Interesse, both first performed about 1547. Bullough (II.274) finds that "Secchi has some significance as developing the vivacious, enterprising heroine sketched in Gl'Ingannati". More specifically Secchi exploits the ironies open to the disguised Heroine in speaking to the Lover about his unrequited love: thus in Gl'Inganni she tells him about a girl who is fair, near him, as easy to come to as herself, and of the same age, while in L'Interesse the Heroine tells the Lover that she loves a woman of his age and complexion.² Similar ironies are found in Twelfth Night (II.iv.88-91 and 24-28 respectively); so though it is not necessary to suppose that Shakespeare actually knew and used Secchi, we can discern how his predecessors in the tradition sometimes concentrated their innovating attention on features which subsequently interested him. Generally however dramatic versions of the story developed it towards lusty intrigue, rather than towards romantic feeling.

Narrative versions had on the whole more to offer. In his tale of Nicuola and Lattanzio Bandello is, as usual, economical in

¹Laelia. A Comedy Acted at Queens' College, Cambridge 1595, ed. G.C. Moore Smith, Cambridge, 1910.

²I.ix, Bullough, II.341-342; and III.ii, Bullough, II.344, respectively.

narration and realistic in motivation—more so, perhaps, than Gl'Ingannati. Yet in two respects he takes the story nearer to romance. On the one hand the novella begins and ends with a reaction of "wonder" to its tale of the incalculable effects of love.¹ Furthermore the behaviour of the protagonists is sometimes made dignified rather than opportunistic in the manner of Gl'Ingannati, so that the lover less readily abandons the Heroine and does not plan to revenge himself on her, while she for her part pleads his cause honourably to the Lady instead of double-crossing him. On the other hand while these points suggest a movement towards the magnanimity of high romance, Bandello's ironical attitude towards love *prima facie* suggests the opposite. He comments more than once on the extraordinary and foolish actions into which love impels its victims, which hardly sounds like a romantic standpoint. Nevertheless insofar as he makes error or folly his underlying idea in place of the deceit which gives its title to Gl'Ingannati, he does move the focal point of the story closer to the romance pre-occupation with feeling. It is consistent with this interpretation that he gives to the first meeting of his Heroine with the Lady, a scene which is not even presented in the play, considerable prominence. The female characters, with their feelings and point of view, are now receiving more attention.

Moreover the tendency continues in Montemayor's Diana, which appeared five years after Bandello's novella in 1559,² for now the

¹"Meraviglia", III.252 and 279 in Brognoligo's edn.

²Probable date: see J.M. Kennedy, ed. Yong's Diana, Introdn. p.xvii.

whole story is narrated in the first person by the Heroine Felismena, and the emphasis upon her feelings and upon the pathetic, irremediable infatuation of the Lady for her has become yet stronger. Since however Diana was discussed in Chapter Three we need only remark here that not only the characters' behaviour but the language has now become refined and courtly. The direct descendant of Montemayor's tale of Felismena was Shakespeare's own Two Gentlemen but neither that play nor any other works in the tradition took over the Spaniard's tragic innovations, the absence of the Brother and the Lady's death of despair. Perhaps indeed his conception of romance was a little too courtly, or too pastorally elegiac, to recommend itself.

At all events the main line of transmission is from Bandello to the French translation, or rather rhetorical and moralizing expansion, of Belleforest and from Belleforest to the version in Barnabe Riche's Farewell. Riche's version is one which we can be most confident that Shakespeare used. The varied amplifications of Belleforest and Montemayor are largely abandoned by Riche in favour of a treatment which has some of Bandello's spareness and irony, though applied differently, and continues the tendency to emphasize the female characters. Yet it may be equally significant for Twelfth Night that Riche's story "Of Apolonius and Silla" has a more general tendency to romantic heightening, which appears in three other aspects of his tale. First he adds a background of romantic event before the entanglement proper begins—Apolonius' campaign against the infidel Turk, the storm which brings him to

Cyprus, Silla's voyage in pursuit of her oblivious beloved, the unwelcome attentions of her captain, cut short by another storm, and a shipwreck. While these events are treated superficially, as the perfunctory furnishings of Arcadian romance, rather than in terms of underlying ideas, they undoubtedly contribute to a heightened dignity of tone. The second aspect has a similar effect. The Lover is for the first time made a Duke, and the Heroine a duke's daughter. More important, the ducal Lover is not inconstant, since before he woos the Lady he does not realize that Silla loves him; as a result his behaviour is not culpable in itself. The third aspect is Riche's attitude to his story, as revealed in his introductory generalizations concerning error, love as error, and the folly of loving without requital (Bullough, II.345-346). The attitude is more one of ironic detachment than of identification with the postulates of romance, yet inasmuch as Riche attempts to see a pattern in events and to give them a moral meaning his discussion offers material for a fuller exploration of the love-experiences presented; that is, for the sort of combination of love and sens which is often the forte of mature romance. Riche's interpretation is actually rather broken-winded, for having stated that "to love them that hate us" is "erronious love" he blames Apolonius for behaving thus foolishly, without seeing that Silla, behaving identically, is rewarded for her persistence. Nevertheless the love-and-requital theme is absorbed into Twelfth Night, and, in a more coherent guise, is made part of its moral centre.

What is implicit in the foregoing survey of the story-tradition up to Shakespeare's own contribution can now be made explicit. He seems to

follow first one predecessor, then another, and though the established view that he owed most to Riche is probably correct, influences from Gl'Ingannati and Bandello, Menaechmi, Errors and The Two Gentlemen are also recognizable from time to time. To trace some of these influences along with Shakespeare's alterations we shall follow his order of events, first for the main plot and then briefly for the sub-plot; then his treatment of character, idea and verbal detail; after which an attempt can be made to summarize the force of his own additions. These in turn lead one to consider the contributions of his own earlier comedies and of the genre of romance.

The shape of Shakespeare's indebtedness to the tradition for his main plot is broadly as follows. Riche is used for the romantic tone and background of Viola's arrival in Illyria, but for the development of the triangular entanglement Gl'Ingannati and Bandello seem also to have contributed. For the arrival in town of Sebastian and Antonio most is owed to Menaechmi and Errors. The finale owes more to Riche than to Gl'Ingannati or its other offspring, since Riche makes a climax of Silla's revelation that she is a woman, but the concluding confrontation of the twins owes most to the tradition of Menaechmi.

The action of Twelfth Night commences at a point prior to the beginning of Gl'Ingannati but subsequent to the beginning of the narrative versions; that is, at a point where the Heroine has not yet taken service as the Lover's page and has therefore not become his ambassador to the Lady, but where on the other hand the Lover's

suit to the Lady is well under way. As a result the first two scenes have a static and a dynamic effect respectively; for though both naturally perform expository functions as well, Orsino's suit is described in terms of circling and futile repetition, but Viola's incipient love for him is full of the energy of her brother's battle with the waves (I.ii.8 ff.) and her own vigorous resilience. Through the rest of the play the stagnation of Orsino's wooing measures the swift development of other wooings, among which should be included his affection for his page. Hence the former relationship is made as purposely unconvincing, because it is becalmed, as the latter is credible because we see it developing.

Such is the effect, if not the purpose of avoiding precedent and beginning with the becalmed Lover and the Heroine's first movement towards him. Another effect is to reduce the amount of exposition, since there is no contact of Viola with the Lover in the pre-play past to be narrated.

Shakespeare begins to draw on Riche in his second scene, where the Heroine's shipwreck is followed by her adoption of male disguise (II.350). The debt is however not profound, and the main impression of the first two scenes is of economy and originality. The next scene of the main plot (I.iv) is again economical, for Viola has so earned Orsino's trust in the interim that a minor character remarks upon it (lines 1-4) before Orsino enters to confirm

it: as a result their relationship has already begun to develop, and the scene ends with the further information that Viola loves her master (lines 40-41).

Having begun so swiftly Shakespeare now dwells longer on the meeting of Viola with Olivia: he has perhaps thrown away the chance to present the first encounter of Viola and Orsino in order to emphasize the ladies' first encounter. In doing so he is not drawing on Gl'Ingannati, in which this meeting too is reported by Lelia; nor does Riche lay much emphasis on the meeting. It is true that he speaks of a gradual change of feeling in his Lady, Julina, over several meetings with Silla (II.351), and marks a decisive point in their relations when Julina brusquely declares her love (II.352); but he devotes no more than a couple of sentences to this part of the story. Something more like Shakespeare's scene is to be found in Bandello. The novella lays some stress on the long passionate looks which Cetella gave Nicuola; the declaration comes gradually, yet at their first encounter (the opposite procedure in both respects to Riche's); and the Lady speculates on the page's birth and status only to brush aside such considerations.¹ Montemayor also shows interest in the ladies' encounters, which he presents gradually and sympathetically, but his narrative is not so close to Twelfth Night as is Bandello's, which shows verbal correspondences as well as a common shape and emphasis. It is indeed in the encounter of the two ladies that the first romance complication that is not stereotyped but personal occurs, and whether or

¹ Brognoligo, II.262-264, cf. TN I.v.261-263, 273-278.

not Shakespeare consciously followed the two novelists he was developing an opportunity which they had already sensed.

The gradual nature of the entanglement in which first Olivia then Viola find themselves is greatly extended by Shakespeare, since it bulks large in two further scenes (II.ii, III.i): first Olivia is brought to a moment of self-realization (I.v.280), then Viola realizes what has happened (II.ii.16 ff), until it is clear that both alike are trapped (II.ii.31 ff). Shakespeare does not owe much to his predecessors for this major movement of the first half of Twelfth Night, and for that reason it can be taken as a clear instance of Shakespeare's power to add to his inherited story-materials (see below). At the same time such extensions are facilitated by the initial decisions to present the beginning of Viola's relations with Olivia, and to make Olivia, like Riche's Julina, the Lover's first (not second) love. The discretion by which Shakespeare simultaneously reduces the amount of exposition needed and heads straight for the contacts of sensibility which most interest him has not often been observed but emerges from a comparison with his sources.

For the second interview of the Heroine with the Lover (II.iv) the influence of Gl'Ingannati is stronger. As its second act begins the Lover (Flamminio) complains that the Lady is "cruel and ungracious" (Bullough, II.302), just as Orsino bids Viola "Get thee to yond same sovereign cruelty" (II.iv.79).¹ Lelia and Viola

¹This passage of Gl'Ingannati may also have caused a (transposed) verbal borrowing because when Orsino at last addresses Olivia directly, some of his first words are "cruel" (V.i.104) and "ingrate" (V.i.107).

foresee failure, and argue that the Lover must accept rejection. Subsequent exchanges include evidence that he feels strong affection for the "page", although whereas Flamminio states as much, twice,¹ Orsino's affection is shown more subtly in his unconscious absorption in Cesario.² Then both plays have a passage in which the Heroine tells the Lover about another lady, who loves him and who is really herself. The handling is cruder in the older work for Flamminio actually names his former love and remarks how alike she and the page are. Viola's ironical reference to "some lady" (II.iv.88) remains vaguer, and of course there is no question of resemblance for Orsino, since he had not known or loved Viola before he met Cesario or loved Olivia. Nor does Shakespeare overwork these ironies as Gl'Ingannati does, repeating the whole sequence in II.vii (II.309-310). Nevertheless he is working over the situation which Gl'Ingannati, however crudely, originated. Since we also find that Lelia reflects on the hopelessness of her fate, loving one who loves another, in the way that Viola does, and begins to find her disguise repellent,³ we must recognize a considerable community of situation between the two plays in this part of the Heroine's adventures, albeit Shakespeare's treatment is usually different if not more subtle as well.

¹ II.i, Bullough II.302, and II.vii, II.310.

² Preeminently at II.iv.102-121, where he quite forgets the urgency of his latest message to Olivia, as he listens to Viola.

³ Compare I.iii, II.292 with TN I.iv.40-41; and II.vii, II.310-311 with TN II.ii.25-39.

The Brother's role consistently owes less to the tradition of Gl'Ingannati than to Menaechmi and Errors.¹ Sebastian's first two scenes, with Antonio (II.i, III.iii), have little more than a general resemblance to the exchanges of Menaechmus the Traveller with Messenio or of Antipholus of Syracuse with his servant, which occur as they arrive in town. The chief exception is that in all three plays a purse changes hands. Since however Antonio does not receive it as a servant from the Brother, but gives it to him as a friend, their relationship and its tone are evidently high romantic rather than broadly comic--a change of emphasis which suggests that the mistakes also, when they come, will involve serious confusions of feeling as well as straightforwardly ridiculous error.

Errors begin when Antonio intervenes on behalf of Cesario, who functions as the resident twin. His error corresponds to Messenio's intervention in defence of the wrong twin,² but his subsequent arrest recalls Errors rather than its source--the arrests of Angelo, Egeon and Antipholus of Ephesus. That a complicated, perhaps barely conscious rearrangement of Plautine material is occurring seems the more likely since Viola's captain, never seen again after I.ii, is also arrested (V.i.266-268). Antonio's reactions also correspond to those of his counterparts, since he interprets events in terms of infatuation, idolatry and witchcraft (III.iv.343-354, and V.i.70). Yet his bewildered sense of betrayal is less comic than that of his counterparts; indeed it is hardly comic

¹The best discussion of the use of these plays for TN is L.G. Salingar, "The Design of TN", Sh.Q., IX, 1958, pp.117-139, esp. pp.137-139.

²Menaechmi V.vi, lines 1000 ff., Loeb edn., II.466 ff. and TN III.iv, V.i.

at all, since he causes a break rather than a continuity with the absurdities of the comic duel.

Much the same obtains for the mistakes in which the visiting twin is taken to be the resident. Sebastian meets the Lady's household before he meets herself, and is offered an invitation and a beating intended for his twin: Feste functions here as the Lady's servant, and Sir Toby resembles the trouble-making parasite Peniculus in Menaechmi.¹ Sebastian's reactions correspond to those of Antipholus: an initial irascibility, and then a wondering acceptance of his fortune when the Lady herself invites him home. On the other hand there has been a change in both characters, Olivia being imperious but not shrewish, and Sebastian passing swiftly through the suspicion of insanity to dreaming wonder and acceptance. The affinities with high romance, as Shakespeare consistently understands it in his comedies, are clear. There is notable economy in the way Shakespeare draws in material from Menaechmi and Errors, not only to fulfil its original purpose, the comic acceleration of mistakes to a climactic anagnorisis in the confrontation of the twins, but also for a new purpose, to extend internal into external error and so into a state of wonder that endures to the play's conclusion.

In what remains of the main plot Shakespeare once more owes most to Riche. One reason why Riche's narration of the entanglement is so brief until the Brother arrives may be that he is more interested

¹Menaechmi II.ii and CE I.ii for the invitation, and Menaechmi V and CE IV.iv, V.i for the violence. In Gl'Ingannati the violence offered to the Brother becomes the ridiculous scene in which two dotards take Fabrizio for his sister (III.vii, II.318-321). Shakespeare makes no use of this amusing, original variant.

in what follows that arrival. In laying stress on the meeting of Silvio and Julina (II.352-354) and on making his climax the enforced revelation by the Lady to the Lover that she is pregnant by his page (II.354-362) Riche was making important innovations in the tradition; and although Shakespeare, following neither the Italians nor Riche, as usual eliminates the premarital intercourse of his comic protagonists, he nevertheless employs a shaping of events and a climax which are redolent of Riche, and owe nothing to the scrappy conclusion of Gl'Ingannati. The essential point is that once the Brother and the Lady have exchanged binding promises (IV.iii and Bullough, II.354) the Brother withdraws for a time, and during that time the Lady claims the disguised Heroine as her husband in the presence of the Lover. There follows a period of acute embarrassment, not to say danger, for both women: the Lady must not only reveal a secret betrothal but endure what appears to be repudiation at the hands of her husband; and the Heroine is attacked verbally and almost physically by the Lover, indignant on his own and the Lady's behalf (V.i, II.360).

Not only the shaping of event but the verbal texture of the novel are at their best in this sequence, so that it is not surprising to find that Twelfth Night shows a pronounced degree of verbal correspondence with these pages (see below). Nonetheless Shakespeare is undertaking a good deal more than Riche, since to Riche's climax he is adding the sort of complicated climax, involving the Brother's friend and the Lady's household, which had been an outstanding success

in Errors; and further complication is achieved because the double imbroglio of the sub-plot--the duel between Sir Andrew and Cesario, and the complaints of Malvolio to Olivia--contributes directly to the final complications and to our ultimate impression of the main characters.

The invention of the sub-plot and its integration with the rest of the play is in fact another instance of Shakespeare's tact in selection and fertility in combination. The skill with which it is integrated is readily recognized if we consider the sources of the sub-plot. We have already noticed that where the sub-plot characters impinge on the main plot Menaechmi and Errors sometimes underlie their interactions; but whereas the household characters of these two plays scarcely compose a sub-plot, and have little independent life or interest, the opposite is true of Olivia's household. On the other hand the sub-plot characters of Gl'Ingannati sometimes have too much independence, the Giglio scenes in particular being virtually detachable. The point does not hold for the foolish lover Gherardo, since he is not only suitor to the Heroine but father to the Lady;¹ but the contrast with Twelfth Night, in which the sub-plot characters are both integrated and independent is surely striking.

The details of the relationship between Gl'Ingannati and the sub-plot of Twelfth Night, which we have already had occasion to mention apropos of festivity and intrigue, can now be stated

¹Shakespeare dispenses with the older generation, perhaps to heighten the self-sufficiency and vulnerability of his young protagonists.

briefly. Malvolio and Sir Andrew share a number of traits with Gherardo, the ludicrous dotard in love. Gherardo is concerned to persuade others, and himself, that he is in love and capable of love; and though the capacity in question is at first physical rather than mental (II.289-290), his mental fatuity soon appears: he gives himself absurd airs of dress, toilet and gait, he sings songs, composes sonnets and scents himself (I.v, II.300-301). Malvolio breaks out into songs and sonnets with equal incongruity (III.iv.23), and though his age is indeterminate he will seem old since he shares with Jaques (As You Like It V.i.4) the decrepitude of the spoilsport. Furthermore since Gherardo's absurd dress is not his own idea but the suggestion of the comic servant Clemenzia, there could have been a hint here for the cross-garters which Maria suggests. Features which Sir Andrew has in common with Gherardo are that both have to be goaded into maintaining their suit, boast of the prowess of their (presumably spindly) legs, and are connected with a ludicrous duel.¹ But although the cluster of resemblances may have helped to set Shakespeare's imagination working, the differences are clearly enormous. Generic influences must be taken into account, since Malvolio is the quintessential enemy of festivity and Sir Andrew shows kinship with the plucked gull of contemporary realistic comedy; but above

¹References are to III.vi-vii (II.316-320), cf. TN I.iii.99-102, III.ii.1 ff., for the goading; I.i (II.289), cf. TN I.iii.123 ff., for the legs; IV.ix (II.331), cf. TN III.ii and iv for the duel, which is however only talked of in Gl'Ingannati.

all they are Shakespeare's own creations--Sir Andrew "the behaviourist's paragon", as Frye calls him, Malvolio a graver conception, the man who is not physically but temperamentally impotent.

To mention Malvolio however is to begin examining the play's character of love--its presentation of characters who can, or cannot, or learn to, love--through which it explores love's nature. And if we are to examine such a theme we must return to the main plot, since the manner in which Shakespeare works up the four lovers of the tradition into Orsino, Olivia, Viola and Sebastian determines the scope and manner of his exploration of love.

A full consideration of the quadrilateral of characters would perhaps need to describe 1) elements constant in the tradition 2) development and variation within the tradition, such as to move it nearer to Twelfth Night 3) Shakespeare's omissions and 4) his additions. We may however circumscribe the last three parts of such an undertaking. Omissions in the present case are of limited significance, since Shakespeare basically expands the story-line, and most of his omissions have already been sufficiently noted. To discuss additions could lead to discussion of almost everything in the play, rather than do which we can rest content with the treatment elsewhere in the chapter of the contributions to characterization of genres and Shakespeare's own earlier work. Lastly development within the tradition has been implicit, if not explicit, in our account of the story-tradition. The constants of the tradition in any case merit pride of place: not only because the very multiplicity of sources suggests that what was central and common to the tradition captured his

attention, but also because it may be in his articulation of what was constant but unformed in the tradition that we begin to see his total design of feeling and idea.

The most obvious constant in the tradition, including Twelfth Night, is that the Heroine's role is the most active: whereas the Lover does not meet the Lady until the end (if then) and the Brother need not meet the Lover at all, it is desirable that the Heroine meet her brother, and indispensable that she meet the Lover and the Lady, and do so more than once. On the other hand the Heroine's active role does not give her control of her own fortunes or other people's¹ because the outcome always depends on the arrival of the Brother, which is always fortuitous. As a result the Heroine is usually placed at the centre of the plot, and if the version is interested in emotional response to what is going forward and in psychological commentary upon it the Heroine's self-consciousness makes the natural vehicle. The range of response will tend to be amusement and pity for other victims of love, along with anxiety and pathos for her own helplessness; mixed with enjoyment of her active role. The character of Viola therefore is in large part an articulation of an emotional range which was conventional, implicit or scattered in the inherited story-tradition, the agents of articulation being—in this case especially—the romance genre and Shakespeare's own earlier treatments of the disguised heroine.

At the other extreme from the Heroine stands the Brother, whose constant role it is to supervene upon an already existing Lelia attempts to control the entanglement, but fails: most other Heroines, Viola included, do not make the attempt.

entanglement: his only task is to resolve it, and the complications of identity which precede the resolution do not monopolize attention in Gl'Ingannati and its tradition. This is one of the main alterations which Gl'Ingannati makes to the disposition of material in Menaechmi and the Brother is further subordinated in subsequent versions, until in Diana he disappears altogether. Shakespeare however, while keeping his role subordinate to the Heroine's in size and interest, makes it of more significance than Gl'Ingannati and its successors had done. He does so, as we have seen, by increasing the amount of Plautine incident in the Brother's part or around it; but it is more important at present to stress Shakespeare's articulation of the character and his attitude to events. Sebastian accepts the Lady's proffered love, bewildering though it is, but instead of doing so in the opportunistic and physically sexual manner of his predecessors his motivation has become spiritual. By welcoming her extraordinary courtesy and brushing aside doubt to respond with wonder (IV.iii.3), he does more than any other character to suggest that romantic acceptance of the wonderful which is the frequent final mood of Shakespearean comedy. His chief companion in this respect is his sister, whose position of greater awareness and activity paradoxically requires her too to accept the outcome which Fortune, not she herself, contrives. Thus maturity of acceptance and ready capacity for love are qualities which unite the twins mentally, as their identical appearance and costume unite them physically. In going beyond the physical correspondences however Shakespeare is extending, or articulating, the conventional obviousness of the traditional material into its emotional and thematic

correlative.

The Lover and the Lady are consistently less active than the Heroine in the tradition, but it is perhaps less obvious that they are consistently presented, however tentatively or *en passant*, as moral deviations from a norm represented by the Heroine (who is joined by Shakespeare with her brother in this respect). Since both points are clearer with regard to the Lover he will be considered first.

The Lover's object is always to win over the Lady, but he generally appears not to have, nor to seek, direct access to her. The convenient result of this fact (and no doubt its cause as well) is that he must employ the Heroine as his intermediary, and that she arouses a perverse passion in the Lady. Yet the requirements of the type-situation are seldom harmonized with his characterization, let alone turned to account, until Riche and Shakespeare. His immobility is surely somewhat debilitating in a man supposed to deserve the love of a spirited heroine, and the difficulty is aggravated because he has usually been unwise enough to abandon the Heroine when he had already won her love. Riche may not have seen the matter in precisely these terms, but he makes important adjustments. One is to make Apolonius a duke, which is a source of romantic dignity but also of potentially ferocious authority (II.356, 360). More important, he has not been fickle to Silla in wooing Julina. Finally the slight absurdity which attends the Lover's role is made conscious and exploited, as when Riche contrasts Apolonius' sublime unawareness of Silla's adoration during his stay with her father (II.346-347) with

his precipitation into total adoration of Julina once he has returned home. An indiscriminate and conventional manner of wooing is satirized in a passage which may indeed have been suggestive to Shakespeare:

"To this Ladie Julina Apolonius became an earnest suter; and accordyng to the maner of woers, besides faire woordes, sorrowfull sighes, and piteous countenaunces, there must bee sendyng of lovyng letters, chaines, braceletes, brouches, rynges, tablets, gemmes, juels, and presentes, I knowe not what. So my Duke, who in the tyme that he remained in the Ile of Cypres had no skill at all in the arte of love, although it were more then half proffered unto hym, was now become a scholler in love's schoole" (II.351).

Orsino represents a further variation of the type. Like all his predecessors he is immobile, becalmed in despairing dependence upon the Heroine as go-between until the finale. Like Apolonius he is a duke, a source of rather arbitrary authority, which may under pressure take a menacing form; and also like Apolonius he has an inconsistency of temperament rather than a morally disabling inconstancy in love. The inconsistency is however more clearly delineated in Orsino: not only does he contradict himself within one scene on the question whether men or women love more truly (II.iv.16 ff., 31 ff., 92 ff.), but the licensed fool is present to categorize him directly (as no one else would dare)—"...and the tailor make thy doublet of changeable taffeta, for thy mind is a very opai" (lines 74-76). In such speeches, and in the languid melancholy that predominates in Orsino's role, Shakespeare has embodied the inward as well as the circumstantial obstacles to true love in the Lover, for he is so much in love with the idea of love that the Lady's discour-

agement merely feeds his delicious despair. So the Heroine's role is to make him face the truth, that he will not be requited (lines 86 ff). Moreover beyond this educative function of their relationship Shakespeare insinuates the truth that, in contrast to the insincerities of his love for Olivia, Orsino loves best where his imagination does not require the artificial stimulus of music, Petrarchan cliché and generalized "love-thoughts" but is spontaneously and deeply awakened. That is surely the point of his preoccupation with the "boy" Cesario at the close of II.iv.

The Lady undergoes similar development. In the tradition she is inactive largely because women are housebound unless they are servants or women of ill repute: hence Gl'Ingannati stresses the immodesty and danger of Lelia's disguise (I.iii, II.292) and Isabella is seen at the house-door but not in the street (II.vi, II.307). Riche's Lady appears to have more freedom to walk abroad, and Olivia, though not seen in the street, has the freedom of a great lady and head of a large household. Inactivity is nevertheless the dominant feature of her role at first, because, by a brilliant invention, Shakespeare has made her wilfully inactive: she has retreated from life and love for seven years in a grief that seems a little excessive (I.i.24-32). She resembles Orsino in being an unwitting poseur, for she thinks she flees love; and resembles him too in that despite her position and authority, she is a person of limited experience and self-awareness, who will be awakened into true love. It is almost as if Shakespeare had asked himself what kind of personalities underlay the typical situation of the Lover and the Lady: what sort of man

would fall in love with a woman disguised as a boy. One answer to such a question might be that the Lady loves an incomplete man because her maturity is itself incomplete; that her passion for the girlish Cesario is a girlish crush.

At the same time Shakespeare does not follow Riche in scoffing at the eagerness of the Lady's desires (II.354). He takes over instead Riche's stress on the vulnerability which attends the Lady's meetings with the Brother, for the situation makes her offer herself, without realizing it, to a total stranger. Of course Olivia gives herself, not her body, and to a less rakish Brother than Silvio proved to be; but in the sequel she experiences the same sense of utter betrayal when she appeals to the Heroine as "husband" (V.i.137). The emotional resonance of this experience of apparent perfidy is intensified because Antonio has had the same experience twice already (III.iv.351 ff., V.i.66 ff.), and because Orsino too is about to undergo it.

Vulnerability in fact was always the inherent consequence, serious rather than comic, of the Lady's situation, but only Montemayor¹ before Riche realized it. Finding it in Riche's final sequence (as the study of verbal borrowings will show) Shakespeare seems to have read it back into all the actions and emotions of the Lady (along with the humbling of her pride); for not only is vulnerability implicit in Olivia's initial shocked retreat from life and in the wary helplessness of her self-revelation to Cesario, but also in a

¹In Diana of course vulnerability is made the differentia of the version, since Celia even dies of unrequited love.

tiny detail like her emblem of Lucrece, twice mentioned (II.v.86 and 97).

Shakespeare has therefore given to the four characters of the inherited external situation the appropriate emotional composition, consistently clarifying the nature and deepening the meaning of the movement of events. This Lady is of a temperament to isolate herself from love, only to be drawn out of self-isolation; this Lover is convincingly revived from lethargy into absorption by the vivacious Heroine; this Brother convinces as the sort to accept love on the instant, following his wonder rather than his understanding;¹ and this Heroine waits, now gaily, now pensively, for time to mature her happiness. They do what they have to do because of the plot, like all their predecessors; but they do it because of what is shown to be their inner nature.

The consequence is that feelings, and the ideas which emerge from the shape of the characters' predicament, seem to control the plot, not the plot the characters and the ideas. What then are the ideas which inform the traditional characters, but also the added ones?

Deceit is the primary idea of the story-tradition, as we observed in the title of Gl'Ingannati ("The Deceived Ones"). The Heroine always deceives the Lover and the Lady, and society at large, by her disguise. Moreover, at least in the dramatic versions, deceit is extended into the sub-plot, where clever, intriguing characters

¹ In Theseus' language, "apprehension" rather than "comprehension" (MND V.i.19-20).

gull stupid suitors (Gherardo and Giglio the Braggart in Gl'Ingannati). Yet although deceit is a structural sine qua non for Shakespeare, he does not appear to find it interesting for its own sake; his language repeatedly stresses the corollary of deceit, the error of others. As the title and substance of his own Errors would suggest, it is the state of mind of the victims of error which carries the force of his serious and comic purposes. In other words the traditional trickery has been transformed, in both plots, into an exploration of delusion, especially self-delusion.

In Shakespeare as in the tradition as a whole these self-delusions are nearly always centred on the experience of love, whose intensity as a form of experience tends to polarize behaviour towards extremes of self-knowledge or its opposite. The theme becomes more articulate the nearer the tradition comes to Twelfth Night. Thus in Gl'Ingannati brief mention only is made of the follies of people in love,¹ but Bandello generalizes the opposition of romantic love and cool reason and Riche expressly relates error to unrequited love. Shakespeare clarifies and deepens the theme of love's errors, by abandoning the simple opposition of erroneous love with stable reason, and the naive view that love offered should be requited. Instead he considers the natures of the three people who have been trapped by their feelings. So Orsino's error is not so much that he loves the wrong person but that he loves her in a wrong way, while Olivia's error is that she rejects any love, and fate punishes her by awakening her to a love that cannot be fulfilled.² Viola's normality,

¹E.g. V.ii, II.334, the "love-madness" of Flamminio, and elsewhere the ridiculous wooing of Gherardo and Giglio.

²Before rewarding her with the male twin she loved in Cesario: "Nature to her bias drew in that" (V.i.252).

defining their deviations, consists in her acceptance, both of her own feeling and of the obstacles to its fulfilment. Finally a third kind of error is found in the sub-plot, which contrasts and further defines these errors of accident and of feeling. This third type is errors induced, for mischief, by Sir Toby and the others. But while these errors are different, in that they are deliberate, they involve accidental errors—including a broken head for Sir Toby himself—and errors of feeling in the ridiculous loves of Sir Andrew and Malvolio. It is one mark of the full development of the sub-plot that errors of feeling are as prominent in Malvolio's love for Olivia as in hers for the page or in Orsino's for her. The connection is in fact made explicit when Olivia says:

I am as mad as he,
If sad and merry madness equal be
(III.iv.14-15)

and

A most extracting frenzy of mine own
From my remembrance clearly banish'd his
(V.i.273-274).

Error therefore, in its various forms, links different parts of the play, but especially in the subtler form of self-ignorance.

The agents of clarification are Feste and Viola; it is symptomatic that both function in both plots. Feste states the theme as clearly as any one when he tells Malvolio (the magnetic pole of irremediable self-concern): "I say there is no darkness but ignorance; in which thou art more puzzled than the Egyptians in their fog" (IV.ii.41-43). Feste and Viola function together as agents of clarification for characters who, like Malvolio, need enlightenment but unlike him attain it—Olivia and Orsino. Feste does this by convicting them of foolishness to their own faces (I.v.49 ff., II.iv.72 ff.), Viola by

arousing them from a self-regarding excess of feeling to self-forgetting absorption in another (I.v, II.iv). Feste and Viola in fact define the follies around them, by their own self-possession (which is however differentiated in turn, his being detached and and disillusioned, hers sympathetic and involved).

The themes of Twelfth Night therefore show the same kind of reorganization and articulation of traditional material as did its incidents and characterization. On the other hand it has to be recognized that the themes have become so much richer and more coherent than the meagre suggestions of the sources that the final impression is more of addition than alteration, of innovation rather than renovation. So it is also with that aspect of the play which most ensures the rich coherence of its themes, namely its language. The language of Twelfth Night owes less to its sources than As You Like It did, as might be expected since in other respects it is further from its main story-source than the other play is from Rosalynde. Nevertheless there are interesting parallels, especially in Riche, which exhibit unexpected transpositions similar to those noticed in earlier plays.

From Menaechmi there are no parallels except for the names "Illyria" and "Messaline" (II.i.16, V.i.224), which are found together in the Roman play.¹ From Gl'Ingannati however there are several, the plainest probably being "accost". The Italian "accostare" means

¹Loeb edn., II.388, line 235 (Act II Scene i).

to approach or draw near, and in the scene where Isabella kisses Lelia and the spying servants comment some form of the word occurs three times (II.vi, Bullough, II.307-308). When "accost" recurs as part of the wit-exchange in which Sir Toby and Maria put down Sir Andrew (I.iii.45-55), the transposition of context and character is complete, except that both passages involve the sub-plot. A parallel that is less fully transposed but also less specific involves a cluster of ideas rather than a single word (II.305, cf. II.279). Isabella's maid says to Lelia:

Truly and seriously, Fabio, you are too proud (tu sei troppo superbo); and I give you this warning: You are very young, and don't know what is best for you. This beauty of yours will not last for ever [non ti durerà]. Your beard will grow; your cheeks will not always be so glowing nor your lips so red...you will repent when it is too late.

The identical words, "You are too proud", recur, transferred to the Heroine addressing the Lady herself (I.v.234). Earlier Olivia has said of her complexion that "'twill endure wind and weather" (line 222), and Viola goes on to speak of the "red and white" of her cheeks, culminating in the plea that she should not let love slip by but leave a copy of herself (lines 223-ff). The two thought-sequences are therefore close, but of course they are found in so much love-poetry of the sixteenth century, not least Shakespeare's own sonnets, that the parallel may be generic rather than specific. Similarly ironies expressed by the Heroine to the Lover about "another lady" who loves him might have been considered a debt to Gl'Ingannati (cf. II.303 and 310) if they did not also appear in Secchi, Bandello, Montemayor and The Two Gentlemen. They can perhaps be considered rather a debt to the story-tradition as a whole, to which they are endemic.

A final parallel with Gl'Ingannati is perhaps more specific, even though it relates themes rather than characters of the two plays. The infatuated Gherardo declares, "io ti do la mia fede che, perch'io sono entrato in questa girandola, non dormo la metà della notte" (*italics mine*, here and subsequently) "I give you my word that since I got involved in this romantic fancy I haven't slept half the night" (II.288). This is in the first speech of the play proper. As the Prologue possibly suggested other themes¹ for Twelfth Night--deceit, Twelfth Night licence, fortune and patience--and it is not unprecedented for Shakespeare's language to reflect details of preliminary and initial writing in a source,² I am emboldened to link Gherardo's words with those of Feste to Malvolio: "And thus the whirligig of time brings in his revenges" (V.i.363). The contextual meaning of "girandola" is "romantic fancy", which of course is not to be found in Feste's speech. Yet because the essential notion of "girandola" in all its senses and of its root "girare" is "whirling" or "spinning", it can mean a thing which spins--a top, whirligig; or the mood of a person who seems to spin--a fancy, a whim; and it can go on to connote, if it does not suggest, the giddiness felt by the person who is spun round by his mood. In the phrase "whirligig of time" Shakespeare picks up, whether consciously or not, nearly all these aspects of "girandola". Time as a spinning-top spins and spins on its own axis, never getting anywhere:

¹The first two are mentioned above, apropos of intrigue and festivity respectively, the second two below apropos of romance.

²Not least when he is not following it for story-line: witness AYL and Rosalynde, or below, Riche's dedicatory epistle.

A great while ago the world begun,
 With hey, ho, the wind and the rain ...
 (V.i.391-392).

As for the whirling of people and their moods, many passages in Twelfth Night use this idea. Sir Toby, for example, says: "He's a coward and a coystroll that will not drink to my niece till his brains turn o' th'toe like a parish-top" (I.iii.37-39). The two senses of "girandola" coalesce in the image of the reveller's brains reeling like a top. Not only the good life of the sub-plot but the love matters of the main plot involve whirling, for Orsino says

Our fancies are more giddy and unfirm,
 More longing, wavering, sooner lost and won,
 Than women's are. (II.iv.32-34)

It is possible then that not only the specific and vivid image of the spinning-top but also a general conception of whirling emotion, revelry, practical joke, and confused identities was assisted by the "girandola" of Gl'Ingannati.

Two parallels with Bandello have not been suggested before, as far as I know. The first runs "[Nicuola] made a bow to [Catella] and began to tell her all that was in his master's commission": "Cominciò egli, dopo fattale riverenza, a dirle quanto in commessione aveva dal padrone" (Brognoligo, III.262). Compare with this Viola's words, "But this is from my commission" (I.v.178), and Olivia's "Have you any commission from your lord to negotiate with my face?" (I.v.216). The second parallel runs as follows, "Paolo was thinking, 'So I have been taken for another person by mistake twice today. This man's daughter thinks I am her Romulo and he thinks I am my sister; but the daughter will not be entirely deceived therein'" ("ma la figliuola

non si sarà già del tutto ingannata," Brognoligo, III.278). With this may be compared Sebastian's words:

So comes it, lady, you have been mistook;
But nature to her bias drew in that.
You would have been contracted to a maid;
Nor are you therein, by my life, deceiv'd;
You are betroth'd both to a maid and man.
(V.i.251-255)

The first parallel occurs at the same point in both versions, in a context which contains generic verbal parallels and correspondences of incident, so that the possibility appears good that Shakespeare's "commission" came from Bandello: both writers develop the contrast between the prepared commission of the Heroine and her startling reception. The second parallel is more generic, but it is perhaps interesting that each Brother perceives that the Lady has not been simply in error in loving him. Yet the elegance and warmth of the words in Shakespeare owe nothing to the novel.

Riche's Farewell provides more parallels than these earlier versions of the tale, parallels which can more probably be considered borrowings by Shakespeare. One passage in particular shows multiple recurrences of single words, the "Epistle Dedicatorie" to the whole collection of romances. Since it has no special relationship to the story of Apolonius and Silla, the second of Riche's eight stories, it is again evident that Shakespeare absorbs and transplants, in a way that appears random but follows some logic of imagination. Riche is excusing his lack of dancing ability to the "right courteous gentlewomen" he is addressing (*italics again mine*):

As firste for Dauncyng, although I like the Measures verie well, yet I could neuer treade them a right, nor to use measure in any thyng that I went aboute...

Our Galliardes are so curious, that thei are not for my dauncyng, for thei are so full of trickes and tournes, that he whiche hath no more but the plaine Singuepace, is no better accompted of then a verie bongler, and for my part, thei might assone teache me to make a Capricornus, as a Capre in the right kinde that it should bee.

For a Ieigge my heels are too heauie: And these braules are so busie, that I love not to beate my braines about them.

A Rounde is too giddie a daunce for my diet...

(ed. Cranfill, p.5, lines 12-15, 18-26 & p.6, lines 1-2).

The terminology of courtly dancing is used by Shakespeare (I.iii), but not now for his characters modestly to excuse themselves. On the contrary Sir Andrew is boasting, while Sir Toby enjoys and abets his ludicrous display of "expertise".

-What is thy excellence in a galliard, knight?

-Faith, I can cut a caper.

-And I can cut the mutton to't.

-And I think I have the back-trick simply as strong as any man in Illyria.

-Wherefore are these things hid?...Why dost thou not go to church in a galliard and come home in a coranto? My very walk should be a jig; I would not so much as make water but in a sink-a-pace.¹ ...I did think by the excellent constitution of thy leg, it was form'd under the star of a galliard...

-Taurus?² That's sides and heart.

-No, sir: it is legs and thighs. Let me see thee caper.
Ha, higher! Ha, ha, excellent!

(I.iii.112-117, 119-122, 123-125, 130-132)

Besides this cluster of correspondences around Sir Andrew's dancing there are other more scattered echoes of Riche's epistle.³

"Dancing" itself is mentioned earlier in the same scene, when Sir

¹The pun is Shakespeare's amusing addition to Riche's straightfaced list of dances. He makes more varied play with the characteristics of all these dances.

²Cf. "Capricornus" in Riche.

³"Measure" appears at V.i.34 and 192, both times in reference to dancing.

Andrew says "I would I had bestowed that time in the tongues that I have in fencing, dancing, and bear-baiting" (I.iii.88). "Brains" and "turns" which appear separated in Riche are joined at I.iii.38, in company with the idea of giddiness though not the actual word:¹ "He's a coward and a coystrill that will not drink to my niece till his brains turn o' th' toe like a parish-top." The same passage contains--for the first time in Shakespeare's work--the word "coystrill", which occurs elsewhere in the Farewell (see Muir, Shakespeare's Sources, I.70). Most of the indebted words are lively in sound or idea or both: has Shakespeare therefore assimilated, albeit unconsciously, the best of Riche's verbal texture?²

So far most of the correspondences have been found in passages of Riche and Shakespeare which are not telling the twins' story; but there are correspondences which occur at the same point of the story in both versions, or at any rate in connection with the same people. The first occurs in the storm-descriptions, where Riche says: "Silla her self beyng in the caben as you have heard, tooke holde of a cheste that was the captaines, the whiche, by the onely providence of God, brought her safe to the shore..." and also "there was every man providyng to save his own life" (Bullough, II.350). Shakespeare's Sebastian combines these when "most provident in peril" he clings to "a strong mast that liv'd upon the sea" (I.ii.12, 14). The idea of a protecting providence is also not absent. Another correspondence, exact this time, is between Julina and Olivia comparing the Heroine's "master"

¹For "giddy", cf. above re "girandola".

²Other parallels from outside the story of Apolonius and Silla include the "Yellow Stockynges" in Riche's conclusion (p.208, line 26), which recall Malvolio's; and the husband who "tied" his wife "in a darke house" (p.146, line 37) which recalls Sir Toby's words: "Come, we'll have him in a dark room and bound." (III.iv.129).

with his "man", to the advantage of the latter: "she fell into as greate a likyng with the man as the maister was with herself" (II.351-352) and "Unless the master were the man" (I.v.278).

A cluster of correspondences is found between respective confrontations of the Heroine with the Lady. Although they do not occur at the same point in the two versions, nor are the circumstances identical, Julina's pleas to Silla at the climax (after finding herself with child), and Olivia's to Viola share a strong sense of hurt, injustice and dishonour. Julina says: "Ah, unhappie, and above all other most unhappie! that have so charely preserved myne honour, and now am made a praise to satisfie a yong man's lust that hath coveted nothyng but the spoyle of my chastitie and good name!" (II.360). Olivia's similar feeling is divided between the two scenes in which she pleads with Viola (III.i and III.iv):

I have said too much unto a heart of stone,
And laid mine honour too unchary out.¹
(III.iv.191-192)

The first line echoes Riche's idea rather than his language, the second inverts his idea but echoes his language. Previously Olivia had called herself Viola's "prey", and memorably extended the whole idea of honour hunted to destruction:

Have you not set mine honour at the stake,
And baited it with all th'unmuzzled thoughts
That tyrannous heart can think? (III.i.115-117)

and

If one should be a prey, how much the better
To fall before the lion than the wolf! (III.i.125-126)

¹First Folio reads "on't".

In conclusion one finds again that the main story-source does not instigate widespread borrowing of verbal texture on Shakespeare's part. The two noticeable areas of correspondence which do occur in the one case link a minor scene in his subplot (I.iii) with a passage of Riche that is outside the story of *Silla* itself, and in the other case centre on the sense of betrayal which each Lady feels. Since both passages of Riche are in fairly striking language it may be that they were absorbed into Shakespeare's memory by reason of their quality; but in Twelfth Night as a whole a predominant desire to absorb the gist of a story seems to have precluded sensitivity to details of language in a source. If so, one might speculate that when irrelevant passages of a source are laid under contribution the explanation may be that, if the borrowing is not simply accidental, his sensitivity to striking language operated most at the fringes of his attention, that is where he was not concentrating on the story. It must be admitted that this is the opposite of what we might have expected, and the opposite of what we find in some other plays (for example the Roman plays); and yet the finding is by no means uncharacteristic of the group of comedies we are examining. Here, conceivably, though one hesitates to be positive on the matter, may be one of the features which distinguish Shakespeare's comic writing from his writing in other kinds.

Because the above details of language absorbed from the story-tradition are comparatively meagre in volume and irregular in distribution it is not surprising that character-names in Twelfth Night also

show few signs of relation to the tradition, and no particular pattern of dependence. It is possible that "Fabian" was prompted by "Fabio", the disguise name of the Heroine in Gl'Ingannati, and that "Malvolio" was prompted by the love-sick "Malevolti" who appeared in Il Sacrificio, the entertainment which preceded Gl'Ingannati at its first performance.¹ There is rather more substance in the derivation of "Cesario" from the disguise name of the heroine of Gonzaga's Gl'Inganni (1592)--"Cesare"; and in the derivation of "Orsino" from the "Orsino innamorato" in Parabosco's Il Viluppo (1547), for even though the latter play is not within the story-tradition it is of the same type as plays which are and Shakespeare could have known of it. Similarly the names "Olivia" and "Violetta" are found in Emanuel Forde's romance Parismus (1598), which includes a disguised heroine but is not connected with Twelfth Night otherwise than generically (Bullough, II.276-277). As Bandello, Montemayor and Riche contribute no names while Il Viluppo and Parismus, which are extraneous to the tradition, apparently do contribute, the only conclusion is that once again Shakespeare's concentration on story-line appears to have prevented his paying much attention to details of nomenclature, whereas more general and less purposeful reading has perhaps left traces on the naming of characters.

One exception to such a generalization must however be made, because one work within the story-tradition does supply names for Twelfth Night: that work is Shakespeare's own play The Two Gentlemen, which supplies "Sebastian", "Valentine" and "Antonio". The first

¹Bullough, II.271-272. He is rightly sceptical, on etymological grounds, and points out that the meaning of Malevolti ("ache-faces") is closer to Sir Andrew's name.

recurrence is the more striking because "Sebastian", which had been the Heroine Julia's disguise-name, is now the name of the Heroine's twin brother; in either case "Sebastian" is the name of her other self. "Valentine" is attendant rather than friend to the Heroine's beloved, but the names are still attached after a fashion.¹ "Antonio", which had been the name of Proteus' father, is now the name of the Brother's friend and protector; yet both Antonios are secondary characters who have a particular connection with a leading male character. To emphasize the latter recurrence further, there is an Antonio, friend and protector of Bassanio, in The Merchant, and yet another Antonio, again an older man, in Much Ado. The pattern of recurrences does not lead to much in the way of conclusions, any more than verbal correspondences and their pattern of transformations do; nevertheless the pattern shows to what an extent Shakespeare's own earlier work may be a source of ideas. Moreover though these recurrences of nomenclature are on a minor scale, there are other recurrences, and new variations on ideas already used, which are anything but minor.

Twelfth Night has in fact been called a masterpiece of recapitulation, for example by Kenneth Muir (Shakespeare's Sources, I.66). As he says (I.66-67),

Shakespeare had already used the device of mistaken identity of twins in The Comedy of Errors...In The Two Gentlemen of Verona a girl, disguised as a page, had acted as emissary from the man she loves to the woman he loves. In Love's Labour's Lost we hear of a woman who died of unrequited love, and her fate may have suggested the Patience on a monument speech. In The Merchant of Venice we have the deep affection of Antonio for Bassanio, which is paralleled by the love of the later Antonio for Sebastian. In As You Like It we have a

¹"Thurio", who is also seen in company with Proteus, may have prompted "Curio", who with Valentine attends Orsino.

fool and a singer; in Twelfth Night we have a singing Fool. In Much Ado About Nothing Beatrice and Benedick are tricked into loving each other; Malvolio is tricked into believing that Olivia is in love with him.

The point is however not simply that Twelfth Night shows a peculiarly wide-ranging indebtedness to its comic predecessors, but that two of these predecessors stand within the story-tradition itself. Hence it proved impossible to discuss the influence of Menaechmi without including discussion of Errors, or that of Gl'Ingannati without at least referring to The Two Gentlemen. So far our treatment might suggest that of the two works Errors was the more significant for Twelfth Night, but the opposite is really the case. As Professor Jenkins remarks, Errors and Twelfth Night are both plays about identical twins who have been separated from one another in a shipwreck and afterwards mistaken for one another even by the wife of one of them, while The Two Gentlemen and Twelfth Night are both about a woman who serves her love as his page, and who in her page's disguise carries his messages of love to another woman.¹ Yet the two earlier plays do not recur in Twelfth Night to the same extent. The influence of The Two Gentlemen is the more potent, and hence in the ensuing discussion of Shakespeare's debts to his own earlier work, though pride of place is given to the two plays over the rest, preeminence belongs to The Two Gentlemen.

In general thematic terms Twelfth Night shares with The Two Gentlemen an interest in constancy and inconstancy, although its omissions, changes and additions are just as significant. The earlier

¹H. Jenkins, "Shakespeare's TN", (referred to in Cap.3 above), p.20. The following discussion of TGV and TN is greatly indebted to his article.

play, as we have argued, presented a quadrilateral of lovers, constant and inconstant; Twelfth Night repeats the quadrilateral, though with only a reduced role for the theme of friendship, and in a sense it repeats also the pattern of constant and inconstant lovers. The theme of constancy is however developed in a more complex way. To put it briefly Orsino's inconstancy is less blatant and melodramatic than Proteus', being expressed less in changeable actions than in a protean¹ restlessness of fancy and avidity for sensation; Viola's constancy is expressed in less forthright ironies because she has no overt claim on her beloved; Sebastian's exemplary fidelity is less tedious than Valentine's and less susceptible to ridicule; and Olivia's role, following that of Montemayor's Celia rather than that of Silvia, is not one of exemplary fidelity at all but rather of a self-deceiving inconsistency, parallel in some ways to Orsino's. So the relatively crude contrast of three faithful lovers with one perfidious one has become a more symmetrical contrast of two forms of genuineness with two of unconscious insincerity.

Such is the general direction of Shakespeare's self-improvements. But to see more clearly that he is in fact using the earlier play as a source, we must turn to the details in particular scenes: especially to the scenes in which the disguised heroine is on stage with the man she loves, and those in which she meets the Lady.

¹It is symptomatic that Orsino's name does not advertise his leading trait as that of Proteus does, yet a similar leading trait is present in mental terms as soon as Orsino self-admiringly proclaims that fancy is "so full of shapes", that is, shape-shifting in the manner of the mythological Proteus. Metamorphosis, perhaps as a result of A Dream, is by now clearly an imaginative process.

The disguised Heroine and the Lover appear together in four scenes of The Two Gentlemen and three of Twelfth Night. Act V Scene ii of the earlier play however need not be considered, because nothing in Twelfth Night corresponds to the mocking of Thurio and the pursuit of Silvia into the greenwood. We are therefore left with three sequences in either play, which correspond quite closely: a scene involving music and song (TGV IV.ii, TN II.iv), a commissioning of the Heroine as ambassador to the Lady (TGV IV.iv, TN I.iv) and the scene in which the disguise is laid aside (TGV V.iv, TN V.i). The last of these will be easier to discuss in connection with Errors, with which The Two Gentlemen overlaps at this point. But as for the other two sequences we notice already that they occur earlier in the action of Twelfth Night, which suggests that they are more important now and that Shakespeare is more exclusively interested in this part of the story than in what has preceded. The scenes also appear in a different order, and have moreover been newly woven into one another; but this point is best considered after discussion of the individual scenes.

The earlier use of music and song is comparatively simple in conception: while the inconstant Lover serenades the Lady, the constant Heroine comments in sadly ironic asides. Though the presence of Thurio, to whom also Proteus is being perfidious, and of the oblivious Host makes the scene dramatically effective, the ironies, and the antithesis between constant and inconstant lovers,¹ remain fairly obvious. Moreover the placing of the serenade before, not after, the Heroine becomes page to the man she loves renders it impossible for the two to converse.

¹The scene from TGV is itself an improvement upon its original in Diana as I argued in Cap. 3 above.

Because Viola is Orsino's page by the time of the music and song in Twelfth Night, the effect can be a good deal richer. We still enjoy a lovely song for its own sake, and still contemplate an ironic discrepancy between the simple absolutes of the song and the more complex love-entanglements which preoccupy the characters who hear it; but now the listeners are contrasted, not by the distinction of inconstant and constant but by the more subtle distinction of types of constancy—as Jenkins puts it, the contrast "between one who is eloquent about an imaginary passion and one who suffers a real grief in concealment" (p.29). Moreover Orsino and Viola are not, like Proteus and Julia, speaking to others or in asides but to one another. This change from obliquity might in itself seem to be moving towards simplicity rather than complexity, yet it is not so: though both musical entertainments consist of instrumental music and the song, the later play separates the two and inverts their order,¹ thereby allowing discussion concerning the first music to shape the characters' attitudes to the song when it comes. Thus the instrumental music leads to Viola's praise of music in terms which show that she understands true love as well: "It gives a very echo to the seat/Where love is thron'd." (II.iv.20-21). These words kindle Orsino's interest in the "boy's" experience of love, so that he can forget himself and simultaneously learn true love from his page—who is also declaring her love for

¹TGV IV.ii.38-52, the song, followed by consort music during lines 61-77 approximately (cf. New Arden TGV, notes to lines 61-77): TN II.iv.15 ff., the music, Feste's song coming at lines 50-65. It is possible that Shakespeare is recalling Diana, in which the serenade includes instrumental music before, between and after the songs: if so, he makes a different selection now from the possibilities of the romance.

him under cover of a more general discourse. Similarly with the song and its sequel: the rapport which these antecedents of the song, and the song itself, establish between master and page leads naturally to passages in which she instructs him "in the necessity of accommodating his fantasies to practical realities" (Jenkins, p.30); and leads also to what is the positive correlative of such instruction, namely the more genuine love-grief¹ of the unfulfilled love of Cesario's "sister". A capacity in Orsino to forget himself has thus been aroused by the music, and thereby his development out of self-consciousness towards the self-awareness of love has begun. No such gradual movement is found in The Two Gentlemen, where Proteus' changes of direction are more like sudden shocks; but in the human insight and technical expertise with which the gradualness is shown lies the difference between the two plays. Precisely where so many ingredients of the dramatic situation are shared, the dramatist's development is most noticeable. A similar conclusion emerges from consideration of the other shared situations, the commissioning and the embassy, to which we now turn.

Viola's commissioning comes, as we have said, a good deal earlier than Julia's, but a more important distinction between the plays lies in the fact that Shakespeare now gives the commissioning two scenes. A germ even of this may be present in the earlier play, since Proteus' exchanges with Julia (IV.iv.37-40 and 59-85) are separated by that with Launce; nevertheless the first exchange is

¹ It is not necessary to think that the "Patience on a monument" speech represents a norm, for it too has a delicious melancholy which naturally appeals to Orsino; but only that its grief is more real than Orsino's.

too brief and undistinguished to be of much importance for either play. In the second however Proteus dwells on his liking for "Sebastian" (lines 59-66) and then sends the page off to Silvia:¹ thinking for a moment on the rejected Julia's love for him (line 69), he is questioned by the page concerning the plight of Julia and the perverseness of the triangular entanglement. Proteus is not much interested, but Julia in soliloquy elaborates further on the ironies and sadness of the whole situation. Here of course Shakespeare is making the most of his material, yet the effect is perhaps somewhat repetitively plangent.

For Twelfth Night Shakespeare repeats a good deal of this, but addition and rearrangement render the effect less straightforward. We do not now witness the first encounter between Viola and the Duke,² but instead hear a third party's testimony to the rapidity of Orsino's favour to her, confirmed and extended at once by his commissioning the page as his nuncio to Olivia: in so doing he stresses his extreme trust (I.iv.12 "thou know'st no less than all"), and she for her part agrees to do her best, against her own self-interest (lines 39-41). The effect here is different, in small but significant ways, from the effect of Julia's commissioning. Though both heroines share the trust of their masters, and despite their divergent interests do not betray it, Viola does not even think of betrayal; and the trusting affection of her master is made nobler and more whole-hearted than Proteus' irritated self-absorption. In other words Orsino is

¹ A subsidiary motive being the ludicrous incompetence of his previous messenger, Launce (IV.ii.51-58).

² It hardly needs stating that Orsino's status makes him immune to the indignity which attends Proteus' because he must employ Launce: this difference echoes the major moral difference in the two men between blatant inconstancy and the more inward trait of inconsistency.

already developing in feeling towards his page, so that one awaits an outcome which will be something new, not a relapse into virtue like that of Proteus. The difference of outcome is of course determined by the difference of situation and character, determined in turn by the different story-lines; but since from Gl'Ingannati and its progeny Shakespeare could, if he had wanted to, have taken a fickle Lover of Proteus' type, it is possible to see the different lines of Orsino's character as intentional avoidance of what he knew from The Two Gentlemen as well as from other sources. In the present particular, since the relations of Orsino and Viola cannot be a reversion to a love already declared then interrupted, they can only move forward; and the comments of Valentine, so soon validated by Orsino's own words, create an air of expectancy.

The scene in which Orsino sends Viola to Olivia for the second time (II.iv) fulfils this expectancy, and takes further the involvement in one another of the two characters. The woeful reaction to love's perversity, which was the dominant note in Julia's response to her commissioning, is now modified: when Orsino sounds it, it is qualified by his increasing absorption in Viola's love-experience, and when she sounds it it forms part of her picture of true love's nature, in herself and her "sister" rather than in the rejected Orsino. Once more we have a sense that the static pathos of Julia's dealings as Sebastian with Proteus is being replaced by something purposive and fruitful in the relations of Cesario with Orsino. Without these relations he would be purely static: with them he is being educated out of self-pity. It is for this sort

of end surely that Shakespeare has doubled the commissioning and placed both so much earlier in the action of Twelfth Night.

The embassy itself is also altered. Not only does it lead to the Lady's infatuation for the disguised Heroine in Twelfth Night and not in The Two Gentlemen, but it is given three scenes as against one: so it becomes still more evident that Shakespeare is giving fuller scope to interactions which had been circumscribed by the different necessities of a different story-line. The three scenes contain in fact three distinct embassies; and though the effect of each is apparent stalemate, since the Heroine simply cannot requite another woman, a different effect is also created, similar to that of the scenes with Orsino. It is one of education, of a turning from self-concern to life and love, in Olivia; and of expectancy.

Yet although such differences are of overriding importance, the early play has contributed in lesser ways to the interactions of Viola with Olivia. As Jenkins notes, "seeds strewn in the earlier play now germinate in Shakespeare's mature inventiveness" (p.33). Thus both Heroines fail, or pretend to fail, to recognize the Lady upon first meeting her and ask her for directions to herself (TGV IV.iv.104-109, TN I.v.158-170); but whereas Julia's question yields only a mildly amusing confusion and no insights into character, Viola's more manifest pretence begins a verbal duel between the women, in the course of which Viola arouses Olivia's interest even more than it is already aroused. As with other repetitions from The Two Gentlemen the effect is made livelier in itself, but also

contributes to a continuing development of character. It is the same with three other repeated items,¹ the ring and the letter which Proteus sends to Silvia, and her picture which he requests. Each of these made a dramatic point: Silvia refused the ring and tore up the letter, and in sending the picture she repeated her scorn of Proteus' idolatrous worship of a "shadow" (IV.iv.116). The points are however only local, and convey no new sense of any character: Silvia's constancy and Proteus' inconstancy remain as they had already been shown. In Twelfth Night on the other hand the three properties contribute to the rapidly evolving relationship between the two women. The letter becomes Cesario's prepared speech, which draws attention to the messenger rather than to her master (Jenkins, p.34); and the fact that the speech is dismissed unheard leads the ladies quickly, but most significantly, to exchanges directly between the two of them. No actual picture is in question, but Olivia's face itself is described as being one (I.v.218). The picture is therefore drawn into the argument by which Olivia, half unaware and half willing, is drawn away from absorption in mourning celibacy into a concern with life, love and children. The ring is brought in last of the three repeated elements, their order being changed in this respect: no longer sent by the Lover to the Lady, but from her to the Heroine, though she pretends otherwise to Malvolio. So, to the quick intelligence of Viola, the ring becomes the sign of what has happened within

¹Also with the purse, which Silvia gives Julia as a reward (TGV IV.iv.172-174) but which Viola indignantly declines when Olivia offers it (TN I.v.267-269).

Olivia (II.ii.15 ff); and just as the "letter" marked the beginning of her change of heart and the "picture" its rapid progress so the ring concludes this part of Olivia's development.

On a larger scale the nature of the Lady's interest in the Heroine has become more dynamic, for whereas Silvia's sympathetic questions and the answers of "Sebastian" concerning the forsaken Julia accumulate pathos (TGV IV.iv.134-175) but change nothing in the disposition of feelings, Olivia's questions to Cesario concern no lady who might love Orsino unrequited,¹ but rather loving in general, which is soon concentrated upon the capacity in loving of "Cesario" in particular. The effect is at once explosive, for Viola's impassioned energy captivates Olivia.

O, you should not rest
 -- Between the elements of air and earth
 But you should pity me!
 -- You might do much.
 What is your parentage?
 (I.v.258-261)

So in the whole scene resides a strong, and original, suggestion of expectancy; of an outcome, as yet unforeseen by any characters, which will nevertheless be convincing, beauteous and other than a reversion to the initial, unproductive love-postures. Here however we begin to speak of fortune and fate in the dialogue, which are better postponed until the final discussion of the romance genre.

Another general similarity between the embassies of Julia and Viola, which again suggests that the one play was a source for the other in this part of the plot, may deserve mention. It is a

¹Such matters are reserved for Viola's exchanges with Orsino (II.iv), where again they can be catalytic.

similarity of shape and sequence rather than of content. The Two Gentlemen presents the commissioning and then, arising from it, a soliloquy for the Heroine. The embassy follows immediately, and then a second, longer soliloquy for the Heroine, the main emphasis at this part of the plot being therefore upon her role and reactions. Twelfth Night observes the same sequence: the commissioning, followed by Viola's brief closing aside; and then the embassy, followed by Viola's realization in a long soliloquy of what has happened to Olivia. All sorts of insertions and extensions have of course been made in the sequence, and the sequence is of course repeated in the second commissioning and embassy;¹ but the sequence itself still underlies, and its repetition is additional witness to its suggestiveness for Shakespeare.

whereas the reworking in Twelfth Night of incidents from The Two Gentlemen is largely in the direction of expansion, most obviously in the double commissioning and the treble embassy, the reworking of incidents from Errors involves a diminution. In our account of the story-tradition it was observed that the kind of mistakes which the twins occasion in the earlier play are confined to the later scenes of Twelfth Night; and the mistakes are further limited in importance because errors of identity induced by the presence of twins are secondary now to the errors of immature love. Yet the debt to Errors remains an important one. It would be superfluous to reiterate points made earlier in connection with the tradition of Menaechmi, but two repeated elements merit consideration

¹There is even a third embassy, III.iv.187-207.

here: the exorcism of lunacy from a sane man, and the massed appearances of characters in the finale.

Exorcism, which is only talked about in Menaechmi,¹ has actually to be endured in Errors, by Antipholus of Ephesus and his Dromio. They undergo terrifying treatment at the hands of "Doctor" Pinch for their supposed insanity, for as Antipholus says,

...all together
They fell upon me, bound me, bore me thence,
And in a dank and darkish vault at home
There left me and my man, both bound together...
(V.i.245-248)

But if this episode has greater emotional force than the idea in Menaechmi upon which it is based, the corresponding episode in Twelfth Night is more powerful and complex again. Malvolio (to whom the exorcism is transferred now) is heard speaking from prison, whereas Antipholus had only reported his incarceration; the scene is more cruel, because the "cure" is not being administered in good faith but in revenge. Moreover when Malvolio protests that he is sane he does so more pathetically: "Good Sir Topas, do not think I am mad; they have laid me here in hideous darkness" (IV.ii.28-30). The hellish connotations of darkness and underground chambers which were latent in the passage from Errors are now made explicit, as Malvolio dwells (obsessively) on the hellish darkness of his prison (IV.ii.35, 44) and Feste cruelly insists that the steward is possessed by Satan (IV.ii.23, 31). The outrage done to Malvolio is as much more grave as his resulting sense of outrage is more deeply felt and ineradicable: it is essential to appreciate Shakespeare's rigour in darkening the moral contours of the mock exorcism to a

¹Loeb edn., II.448-452, lines 829 ff. (V.ii).

conclusion with disturbing vibrations. He thus goes further than Errors in diversifying reactions to the curing of an imaginary insanity and in probing its inner, emotional nature.

The second recurrent element which merits consideration is concerned with Shakespeare's construction of his finale. In both plays, in order that confusion may be multiplied as much as possible up to the moment when the twins are seen together, a succession of characters, some of them added to the main source, are brought on to tell their story of confusion. In Errors we hear Adriana, then her husband, then the merchants, then the Courtezan, then Dromio of Ephesus, then the twins' father. In Twelfth Night we hear Antonio, Olivia, Viola, the Priest, Sir Andrew and Sir Toby. All struggle to make sense of what has happened, but because each speaks from a partial perspective they only make matters worse, resorting to accusations of witchcraft for example. Resolution comes of course when the twins at last confront one another on stage: this simple but effective climax Twelfth Night shares with Menaechmi and Errors but with the addition, from The Two Gentlemen perhaps, that the ensuing explanations centre upon the Heroine's abandonment of her male disguise. The main difference between Twelfth Night and these predecessors is that now the Duke is not outside the confusions like Solinus, or half-outside like Silvia's father, but very much involved in them. When Orsino himself resorts to threats and violence (V.i.111-125), there is an intensification of disordered event and disorderly emotion, whose effect is to make the final order more welcome; but also, for the

first time in Shakespeare's comedies,¹ perhaps more fragile, since Malvolio and Feste are not really contained by the new comic order. Here too Shakespeare is repeating aspects of Errors in a way which intensifies the borrowed elements and makes them graver.

Errors and The Two Gentlemen may both have prompted a more general form of variation within repetition, namely the organization of story-line upon the interactions of a central quartet of lovers. In Errors Adriana seems to witness a change of feeling in her husband, from such love as he had for her to an alarming, incestuous passion for her sister: alarming developments are however explained and resolved as soon as the presence of identical twins becomes known. Something similar and perhaps derived involves the twins in Twelfth Night, although now Sebastian comments that beneath the accidental mistakes lies a truth of nature—"nature to her bias drew in that" (V.i.252)—so that a metaphysical meaning of events is being added to the more farcical and straightforward implications of Errors. In The Two Gentlemen however change of affection is not apparent but real, so that Proteus' mutation is watched with abhorrence by the other characters in the quartet. When resolution comes with Proteus' repentance and return to his first love, the result is less a manipulation by fate than in Errors, and constancy, which is perhaps the main theme of the play, is strongly reasserted. Twelfth Night incorporates some of these features. Orsino's acceptance of Viola's love and Olivia's acceptance of Sebastian's are not

¹ MV, MA and AYL do not really confute this proposition because Shylock and Don John, though unequivocally alien, are defeated and Jaques has become almost affable by the end of AYL.

purely, or even mainly, the result of manipulation but the outcome of a change of feeling; and this feeling involves constancy, as in The Two Gentlemen, at least as far as Orsino is concerned. He is in the structural position of Proteus, placed between the Lady and the Heroine, yet his emotional composition is rather that of Valentine, constant to the idea of love but volatile in most other aspects of thought and behaviour (Jenkins, p.26). Orsino however has to learn true constancy, from Viola (II.iv), in which respect he repeats—more gradually and less crudely—the journey of Proteus. The reference to Orsino's predecessors in The Two Gentlemen provides one more index of the greater complexity, and especially the powers of combination, which Shakespeare has brought to the reworking of his own play, as equally to his manifold other story-materials.

Other predecessors of Twelfth Night include a quartet of course—The Shrew, A Dream and Much Ado especially—but these plays are less clearly contributory. If a debt is to be found in them, it will be in other respects. Thus The Merchant includes an Antonio, bound like Sebastian's Antonio in deep friendship to a younger man, a recurrence which is pretty evidently a self-borrowing. Moreover the friendships produce similar dramatic effects. First, the worth of Bassanio and Sebastian is proved by the intense friendship which they arouse and reciprocate, so that they are felt to deserve their good fortune in winning the love of Portia and Olivia. Second, there is a similar resonance to the two Antonios, for both are deeply loyal, and represent an extreme of trust and sacrifice. Both readily give their wealth up to their friend (MV I.i.135-185, TN III.iii.38 ff), hazard also their personal safety, and are betrayed by circumstance.

But whereas the earlier Antonio has no cause to repine, the later one turns in despairing rebuke on Viola:

Do not tempt my misery,
Lest that it make me so unsound a man
As to upbraid you with those kindnesses
That I have done for you.
(III.iv.333-336, cf. 349-354)

His speech is one of the most heartfelt in the whole play: in spite of the comic mistake he is making (the first of a series in which each twin is taken for the other) his intensity remains near-tragic. Though he is minor where the earlier Antonio is a central, eponymous figure, and choleric where the other is melancholic, both stand for something of passionate intensity, not easily assimilated into the comic harmony; and this increased difficulty of assimilation we have noticed elsewhere to be integral to the new purposes for which in Twelfth Night repeated elements are used.

Much Ado is followed by Twelfth Night in details of structure and source-use. It uses eavesdropping: Benedick (II.iii) and Beatrice (III.i) overhear fabricated reports of how each is loved by the other. These excellent scenes¹ may have suggested their converse for the later play, where Malvolio does not overhear but is overheard: the resulting deception is more sour in his case, for it leads not to love but to humiliation. More generally the double trick played on Beatrice and Benedick is not unlike the double joke played on Sir Andrew and Viola, involving the clever manipulation of opinion and so of feeling. In neither case is the result quite what the instigators expected, but again the eventual outcome is more sombre in the

¹Both involve hiding behind trees, with which cf. the box-tree in TN, and also LLL IV.iii.

later play.

As You Like It anticipates, and may have helped to inspire, other and more numerous features of Twelfth Night, the most obvious of which are the disguised heroine, her dealings with the man she loves, and the complications arising when she is loved by another woman: the Phebe sub-plot is as it were made the main plot.¹ As well as general debts there are particular ones. Just as Rosalind in disguise insists that she loves "no woman" (V.ii.81, etc.), so Viola declares:

I have one heart, one bosom, and one truth,
And that no woman has; nor never none
Shall mistress be of it, save I alone.
(III.i.155-157)

In both cases the irony consists in a double emphasis: "no woman", for her listener, "no woman" for herself and the audience. But if this irony is almost identical in the two comedies, other aspects of the Heroine-Lady relationship become significantly different. Because Olivia is a more substantial, less petulant woman than Phebe, Viola is essentially more respectful than Rosalind (even though both continue the sauciness of Portia and Nerissa): indeed the whole love-complication is more seriously and centrally treated. If Phebe cannot win Ganymede, she may still fall back on Silvius since she has no rival there; but if Olivia cannot win Cesario she will not therefore accept Orsino. Life is more difficult for the three lovers now, and that is why there is more emphasis on the pain of disguise (II.ii, III.iv). One senses in these differences an increasing austerity of comic vision, a less blithe acceptance of love's diversity; perhaps even to the degree of inferring that

¹Of course AYL is not the sole source, since the situation is in Gl'Ingannati.

in Twelfth Night Shakespeare sometimes reacts against As You Like It, as well as extending it.

Structurally and thematically too the plays differ within their similarity, in a way that is perhaps conscious.¹ The action of As You Like It begins energetically, but settles down to explorations of love and pastoral: Twelfth Night begins languorously, then explores nuances of love, but turns finally to increasingly energetic action. Both plays explore and expose a spectrum of affectations:

As You Like It is the comedy of the romantics, of the imagination which runs away with the facts of life and frames impossible ideals on the extravagant assumption that human nature in a forest is something wholly different from human nature in a court. Twelfth Night in its turn is the comedy of the sentimentalists, of the tendency of minds pent in the artificial atmosphere of cities to a spiritual self-deception, whereby they indulge in the expression of emotions not because they really have them, but because they have come to be regarded by themselves or others as modish or delightful emotions to have.²

Part of the exposure of affectation is the work of characters who are themselves satirists, like Jaques, Touchstone and Feste. Feste surely develops from Touchstone; but if so his relation to the action of Twelfth Night is not identical with Touchstone's to As You Like It. He represents rather a development of this type of character towards greater disengagement and acceptance of disillusion. Because he sits loose to the play he can be seen in every milieu. He can speak the Epilogue because disenchantment comes most fittingly from him, whether it be interpreted as the end of the play's enchantment, the end of the Twelfth Night holiday, or the close of the whole group of

¹Shakespeare perhaps explores comic diversity not only within plays but across them.

²E.K. Chambers, Shakespeare. A Survey, p.136.

"happy comedies". The outsider like Feste sees or unconsciously expresses less golden possibilities of life than either the lovers or the revellers,¹ and all the more so because the play includes another outsider, who has no self-protection in satire, and who more clearly than any character in As You Like It remains outside the final comic order.

The fate of Malvolio is proper enough in the context of revelry, but the context is hardly strong enough to drown completely the overtones of Hamlet; the malcontented outsider is not always despicable. In Twelfth Night the impetus towards reconciliation is sufficiently tentative to allow such thoughts, and in such thoughts lies the death of Comedy.²

Again the effect is less buoyant in the later comedy and again it is natural to conclude that the timbre of As You Like It helped to prompt the different timbre of Twelfth Night.

The foregoing discussion allows us to conclude that in its use of elements from earlier plays Twelfth Night is a masterpiece not only of recapitulation but also (as in its use of a multifarious story-tradition) of combination. From The Two Gentlemen, though not only thence, Shakespeare has drawn the love quadrilateral, a thematic concern with constancy in love and a woman page. The page was already important and now becomes more so, while conversely the friendship motif is made much less important, its role in The Merchant being as it were intermediate in importance and suggestive of its role in Twelfth Night. From Errors rather less is drawn: the twins, supposed madness, the organization of mistakings (the latter perhaps owing something to A Dream as well), and the overarching movement

¹C.L. Barber, Shakespeare's Festive Comedy, p.261.

²G.K. Hunter, William Shakespeare. The Later Comedies, p.55.

through shipwreck to reunion, for which Riche's story and the romance genre are more clearly influential. The fully developed sub-plot owes a certain amount to Errors and its tradition, but has in fact borrowed a little from each of a variety of predecessors: from Love's Labour's Lost and A Dream a group of lowlife characters, whose realism and capacity for enjoyment are both extended and qualified; from The Merchant and Much Ado the outsider who rejects the capacity for enjoying festival, and from Much Ado also the trick played on Malvolio; from the Henry IV plays a little of the spirit of Eastcheap in Sir Toby's mode of sociability. Feste, the figure who is detached from both worlds of the plot as well as being present in them, owes most to Touchstone, even though the latter fool did take a place in the marital relationship of the sub-plot; and As You Like It may have helped also with the Heroine's role and the entanglement which it causes.

Nevertheless the impression conveyed by the unusual fullness of self-indebtedness in Twelfth Night has immediately to be qualified by the sense that its repetition of familiar elements serves purposes which go beyond those of its comic predecessors. As the practical joking of the sub-plot goes sour, we notice a more unified ethical vision than in most of the play's predecessors, and even, in Malvolio's self-assertive alienation, a more troubled resonance. In the main plot too the repetition-amid-variation of the quadrilateral contributes to perceptions like Antonio's sense of betrayal or Viola's sense of the transience of love, which surpass their predecessors in intensity

and in metaphysical implication. The effect of examining Shakespeare's (probably unconscious) use of his earlier work as a quarry is assuredly not to excuse him of parsimonious self-plagiarism, but to realize afresh his amazing originality and to perceive more clearly his constant growth in skill and insight.

Just as the play is a culmination in respect of its power to combine materials from earlier works, so it is in respect of its use of genres--in the combination of romance with other genres, and in the exploration of the inner core of romance itself. As in other comedies, but perhaps to an increased extent, the essentially romantic plot is associated with an astonishing variety of generic materials and attitudes--sometimes because an element stands in another genre at the same time as in romance, disguise for example belonging naturally to intrigue comedy and festive tradition as well as to romance, sometimes because the power of romance (itself shared with comedy) to contain variety is used to accommodate disparate ideas. We are now, I think, in a position to consider how the inclusion of such ideas affects the whole design of Twelfth Night, and to assess the effect of their co-presence and interaction with romance.

As usual the effect, perhaps the primary effect, of variety is to please: high comedy is balanced by low comedy, as verse and prose and song set off each other. Yet the delight of variety in Twelfth Night consists in more than humour and aesthetic pleasure, since not only the romantic ingredients but also those of intrigue and festivity occupy a place in its spectrum of feelings and ideas.

The holiday spirit implied by the title and incarnated in the sub-plot supplies an implicit judgment of life-denying instincts in Malvolio and Olivia, and is itself placed by the more mature enjoyment of life in Viola and the perspectives of human time revealed by Feste. Similarly, absurd mistakes lead to an appalled sense of betrayal in Olivia and Antonio which is anything but purely ridiculous, and the ebullience of the sub-plot intrigue not only becomes increasingly vengeful and even cruel but is placed as such by its outcome.¹ The appropriate scope and desirable limits of these genres, and of their implicit view of life, are tactfully yet clearly being defined in the play. To put it another way, while the genres do not necessarily or even naturally connote sens, they are so handled in Twelfth Night as to contribute to that serious exploration of feeling and idea which is integral to romance; there is therefore no discontinuity between the intrigue and festive elements on the one hand and on the other the sens of romance which controls the presentation of the quadrilateral of characters.

Sens itself has been intensified in the main plot, by alterations which we have noticed. Two in particular are significant at this juncture. The first is the alteration by which the Lover is no longer fickle and the Lady no longer merely ridiculous or pathetic, but fully persons undergoing a predicament and testing of feeling. The second, also owed in part to Riche's story, is the combination of the Lover's role with that of ruler in the society of the comedy's

¹Just as Sir Toby and Sir Andrew at their final appearance lack dignity, Malvolio at his possesses it.

world. Whereas previous Dukes, with the exception of Navarre, had been aloof from the follies and glories of love and therefore slightly aside from the centres of sens, Orsino is personally involved. The effect is to make the love-entanglement a more universal, but also a more hazardous crisis, since now that the source of authority is himself found wanting¹ who is to guarantee a just outcome? The play does in fact have an answer, which emerges from our final consideration of the function of romance in the play. Just as making the Lover a ruler heightens the danger it also dignifies the tone of the action and the behaviour of the principals; but the heightening effect of romance is extended further than ever before in Shakespearean comedy, into a consideration of the laws of causality affecting the characters and shaping events. It is along these lines that Shakespeare's use of romance gives meaning as well as harmony to the play's variety, and that Twelfth Night can be seen as the end and climax of our group of comedies.

That the conception of romance in the play is higher than usual is plain if its use of courtliness is considered. It is surely unprecedentedly courtly, and owes little in this respect to the story-tradition.² Not merely do Orsino's court and his courtiers, his behests and his whims, claim continual notice--the same might conceivably be said of Duke Frederick in the early acts of As You Like It--but the values of his court are given an importance and an approval

¹ A theme considered by Shakespeare at this period in HV and MM as well.

² Riche's Apolonius is also a duke, the first in the story-tradition, but his court supplies no details. Montemayor's tale of Felismena shows more general interest than Riche in courtly values but contributes nothing more specific in this respect to TN.

not found in the earlier comedy. In the first scene there is of course a self-indulgent languor about Orsino's court, but also a harmonious grace and music unknown in *Frederick's*, whose vices are equally unknown in Orsino's: courtly virtues, not courtly vices, are important. The value of good birth is endorsed (I.ii.25, I.v.275), as is the value of good breeding (I.iii.23-25, V.i.310), and of good manners (I.v.193-202, V.i.106). In fact the play distinguishes true courtesy from superficial, and gives it an almost ideal value. Thus what makes the twins worthy of love and the roisterers worthy of discomfiture is that the former have, and the latter lack, courtesy, the instinct to respond appropriately and with consideration to different people and varying situations.¹

The language of the court is pitched correspondingly higher than in *As You Like It*. The play includes a higher proportion of verse and of rhyme. Its prose too rises where necessary to well-mannered amplitude, as in the exchanges of Sebastian with Antonio: "I perceive in you so excellent a touch of modesty that you will not extort from me what I am willing to keep in; therefore it charges me in manners the rather to express myself" (II.i.10-14). It is no accident that so courtly a prose occurs in a context of magnanimous friendship, for the ideal Renaissance courtier was supposed to prize friendship supremely, beyond even love. Since courtliness is here not witty, as it had been in, for instance, *Love's Labour's Lost* and *Much Ado*, we may perhaps conclude that Shakespeare wishes to emphasize the courtliness which controls manners and feelings rather than that which sharpensthe wits

¹ Cf. C.L. Barber, *Shakespeare's Festive Comedy*, pp.248 ff., "Liberty Testing Courtesy". Malvolio is superficially civil, inwardly inconsiderate of other people, and Sir Toby, despite his freer manners, has no real consideration for people.

and intellect.

The setting of Twelfth Night is as high romantic and courtly as its language: in its own way it is equally appropriate. Illyria was on the Mediterranean, or rather the Adriatic, coast, but its name probably connoted no more precise geographical or political entity for most Elizabethans than it does today. Yet the very vagueness of the name has advantages for the romance, because it suggests remoteness and remoteness lends grandeur and wonder to the adventures. The heightening by vagueness is however supported by the few positive associations of "Illyria".¹ The most general of these is with the Mediterranean.² Greek New Comedy and the Greek romances made that sea the typical setting for tales of shipwreck and loss, so that from the plays of Plautus and Terence to plays like Pericles and The Tempest the tradition is unbroken. Danger and adventure by sea are still more suitably placed on the Adriatic, which was reputed a particularly treacherous part of the Mediterranean. Horace speaks of "fractisque rauci fluctibus Hadriae", "the breakers of the roaring Adriatic" (Odes II.xiv.14) and "Auster/dux inquieti turbidus Hadriae", "Auster, the stormy master of the restless Adriatic" (III.iii.4-5), and Shakespeare himself compares a shrew's "roughness" to "the swelling Adriatic seas" (TS I.ii.71-72). The shipwreck of Errors I.i is off Illyria, and near by is the sea-coast of Bohemia where another wreck takes place. Illyria had a bad name for

¹ It is clear how vague the "Illyria" of TN is if we contrast "Athens" in MND or "Venice" of MV, where Shakespeare exploits their known attributes.

² "Candy" in Crete is mentioned (V.i.55); and "Messaline" (II.i.16, V.i.224) may be Marseilles.

piracy, for we hear of threats like those of "Bargulus, the strong Illyrian pirate" (2HVI, IV.1.108), and of Ragozina--the man from Ragusa, in Illyria--"a most notorious pirate" (MM IV.iii.67), in language which resembles that of Orsino's rebuke to Antonio, "Notable pirate, thou salt-water thief!" (V.1.63). So although Antonio's piracy is more patriotic than personal it derives from Illyrian turbulence as well as from Elizabethan privateers. The other notoriety of Illyria was for drunken rioting. Nashe speaks of "their riotous neighbors, the Illirians",¹ and A. Fleming in 1576 of the "wine bibbing of the...Illyrians: Neither are the Illyrians clear of this beastly abuse."² Shakespeare has chosen a place-name therefore which suits the revelries of the sub-plot as well as the high adventures of the main plot. Finally the sound of the name "Illyria" is beautiful, idyllic. Although it is easy to read back into Twelfth Night associations which the name has gathered over the years from the play itself, there is no reason to doubt that Shakespeare was sensitive to its agreeable sound. All in all the setting appropriately suggests remoteness, grandeur, danger, piracy, valour, turbulence of men and the elements and yet a strange beauty and peace emerging through them.

This power of combination and evocation is found on a larger scale in the treatment of adventures. Physical struggle is quite prominent in the stage action, and as in Errors it is usually based on misunderstanding and farcical in type. Yet almost

¹The Works of Thomas Nashe, ed. R.B. McKerrow, 5 vols., Oxford, 1904-10, reprinted with corrections, 1958, III.367.

²A Registre of Hystories, Sig.I.2^v, quoted by Leslie Hotson, The First Night of Twelfth Night, 1955, p.151.

always where main plot characters are involved it is not merely ridiculous but is combined with serious meaning and the resonance of romance. For example both Sebastian's scuffles with Sir Toby shape the love-encounters with Olivia which follow them (IV.i and V.i.173 ff.), and Antonio's mistaken intervention in Viola's duel rapidly assumes an intensity of feeling that is not farcical. So although farcical intrigue is combined with romance as in Errors, greater prominence is now given to romance in the adventures of the protagonists.

The imaginative reach of the play is to a surprising extent owed to these physical adventures. The struggles of the romantic characters are coloured by frequent reference to romantic adventures which have occurred before the time of the stage action. Though Errors has such adventures they are confined on the whole to the first and last scenes, and their significance is less for the twins than for their parents. Because prior adventures bulk larger in Twelfth Night than in the sources¹ and earlier comedies by Shakespeare it is necessary to review this dangerous past, and to assess how it shapes responses to the stage present as that becomes increasingly dangerous.

On her first appearance the heroine has narrowly escaped death by shipwreck. She fears that her brother, from whom the wreck has separated her, is drowned, but the Captain's narrative

¹In Gl'Ingannati the only violence is the sack of Rome, and though the sack is mentioned more than once it is usually in exposition. In Riche's novel Apolonius' exploits against the Turks perhaps prepare for his violence towards Silla, but past and present are not brought together to illuminate each other as they are in TN.

gives her hope:

...I saw your brother,
Most provident in peril, bind himself—
Courage and hope both teaching him the practice—
To a strong mast that liv'd upon the sea...(I.ii.11-14)

The vigour of the verse conveys a lively sense of peril: it also enacts the man's courage.¹ The same man is joined in his first two appearances with Antonio, about whom associations gather of sea-battles and far journeys, courage and principle (III.iii.25-37).²

In the finale the shipwreck and the sea-fighting are brought together when Orsino accuses Antonio and Antonio accuses Viola (V.i.44-86), amplifying our knowledge of both past events; but by this time the present too is violent, for Orsino soon speaks of killing his lady (lines 111-113), or his servant (lines 114-125). The combination of past and present is completed by a backward look, not at past events but at romantic literature itself, when Orsino's threats refer to an incident in Heliodorus' Aethiopica:

Why should I not, had I the heart to do it,
Like to th' Egyptian thief at point of death,
Kill what I love?—a savage jealousy
That sometimes savours nobly. (V.i.111-114)

Thus the romantically violent, even melodramatic past is regularly brought in to magnify the heroism of principal characters. This happens at critical points of the present action, and especially when the mistakes intensify towards the moment of anagnorisis.

Because the struggles of the main plot characters are dignified by allusion to a heroic past there is not the same risk as in Errors

¹The storm and the wreck may owe something to Riche (Bullough, II.349-350).

²Some of these associations gathered about the Antonio of MV, in which play sea and shipwreck also connoted a heightening risk and daring.

³The community of ideas with Othello is remarkable, and Orsino's mood at this point, romantically melodramatic and tending to violence, is like the Moor's.

that the struggles will seem purely ridiculous.

Another use of past events is important. In many romances the characters are shipwrecked and separated, meet later unrecognized, and after confusions are reunited. Such stories have a satisfactory, because cyclical, shape. Especially for a dramatist, who can begin his play near the end of the cycle, during the confusions and just before the recognitions, the stories provide ready-made dramatic unities, Errors being a classic instance. Yet in his late romances Shakespeare sometimes began his action much earlier in the cycle, so that Pericles and The Winter's Tale bypass the classical unities. Twelfth Night observes them more than these plays do, but the prior events are still treated more fully than we should expect from Errors. Shakespeare seems to be moving from simple use of the narrative shape of romance towards an exploration, such as we find in the late romances, of ideas underlying the shape.

Twelfth Night is perhaps his first comedy in which the shape of events is given almost a metaphysical meaning, centring on Fortune, Chance and Fate. The intimations of this meaning begin as soon as the initial shipwreck is discussed. When Viola says of her brother "Perchance he is not drown'd" (I.ii.5), she and the Captain at once debate whether or not chance is a ground of hope (lines 5-21). Sebastian in turn speaks of fortune, and its influence on human affairs, when he first appears on stage: "My stars shine darkly over me; the malignancy of my fate might perhaps

distemper yours" (II.i.3-4). By a dexterous irony Shakespeare makes him less sanguine than his twin just when the audience learns that both are alive and that consequently their fortune is good. Between these two responses to fortune we are presented with another, that of Olivia. After her first meeting with Viola she realizes she cannot control her feeling, and ascribes what has happened to fate:

Fate, show thy force: ourselves we do not owe;
What is decreed must be; and be this so!
(I.v.294-295)

Insofar as this is a buoyant acceptance of fate it resembles Viola's attitude; but in its amusing eagerness it is probably less mature, for she is dictating to fortune the future she desires. Ironically fate is being most unkind, in making her love a disguised woman; and yet beyond that irony is another, that her love for Cesario will bring her Sebastian. Later when Viola divines what has happened she too speaks of fortune: "Fortune forbid my outside have not charm'd her!" (II.ii.16). She too accepts the outcome blindly, but with two differences. She does not desire the outcome as Olivia does, because she cannot foresee how the circle of love-complications (II.ii.31-37) will benefit herself. Moreover she consigns events, not to fate or fortune, but to time:

O Time, thou must untangle this, not I;
It is too hard a knot for me t' untie! (II.ii.38-39)

The mention of time in place of fortune probably hints that she interprets events in terms of a benignant time, time as a natural, cyclic process, by means of which a reward may come to those who show

patience. If so, the contrast will be with the blind, possibly capricious fortune to which Olivia tries to give orders; yet elsewhere in the play fortune is benign, and time on the other hand is indifferent, as in Feste's final bleak perspective. At all events two more ideas, closely related to fortune in the romance nexus, are outlined: time and patience.¹

A further variety of responses to fortune is deployed as the play goes on. Malvolio's first words in the gulling scene are: "'Tis but fortune; all is fortune" (II.v.21). His interpretation of the situation in terms of fortune is, like Olivia's, full of irony, but this time the irony is more cruel; since though Malvolio deceives himself through self-love into interpreting fortune to suit his wishes, the agent of his discomfiture is not fortune but Maria--the very person whose testimony he uses to support his view of his fate: "Maria once told me she did affect me" (line 22).

In strong contrast to the attitude of Malvolio a normative response to fortune is developed around the twins. Viola, who has already moved from vague hope to patient acceptance, advances further in III.iv. Amid all the confusion and fear of the duel and Antonio's inexplicable reproaches she seizes the one new ground of hope: "He nam'd Sebastian" (line 363). She recognizes the quality in herself which is responding to this windfall:

¹These two are closely connected in WT where the personified figure of Time introduces himself: "I, that please some, try all, both joy and terror/Of good and bad, that makes and unfolds error"(IV.i.1-2).

Prove true, imagination, O, prove true,
That I, dear brother, be now ta'en for you!
(lines 359-360)

Imagination recognizes too that "if it prove, / Tempests are kind, and salt waves fresh in love!" (lines 367-368). Imagination may well delude, as Malvolio's does, and Viola has the wit to realize that the recognition is as yet provisional. Nevertheless imagination has connected events which are beyond human control with moral qualities and kindly purposes. The sea, and the fortune with which it is associated as instrument, have become less inscrutable as moral agents. Sebastian's response to the inexplicable advances of Olivia shows the same maturing. He debates the possibility that she is mad, or that he is, only to dismiss it in favour of love; which is another way of saying that, faced with new experience, he rejects the unimaginative view that the experience is merely unreal. He moves forward to acceptance of whatever it is, and tries to interpret it. He too intuits that fortune and the sea are somehow moral agents, and somehow connected, for he joins them in the words "this accident and flood of fortune" (IV.iii.11). He names the mood which will enwrap the play's conclusion as now it enwraps him: "'tis wonder" (line 3). That conclusion is preceded by the violence of Orsino, Antonio and Sebastian himself (V.i.45-203), a tempest now within the characters. Then the lovers can recognize that the events have been beneficent, that it is a "most happy wreck" (line 258).¹ Shipwreck is once more joined with the ideas of fortune (line 249), and time as Orsino looks ahead to marriage "when golden time convents" (line 368).²

¹The oxymoron recalls the Christian tradition of "felix culpa", which is found in Gonzalo's assessment of the wreck in The Tempest, V.i.205-213. Cf. F. Kermode's introduction to the New Arden edn. of that play, 1954, pp.1 and lxi.

²Fortune is mentioned three times in V.i, at lines 142, 244 and 249.

The tentative intuitions of the play seem therefore to be these. Fortune collaborates with time, sea and tempest. They are unpredictable, seemingly irrational forces, surrounding man, and often overriding his wishes. Yet they are also to some extent purposeful, because they can be moral, even benign, if man responds to them wisely. In fact as far as romance is concerned they are a test.¹ The qualities they test are endurance in older people, like Antonio (compare Egeon, Pericles and Leontes), resilience in younger people like Sebastian and Viola.² They test imagination, the quality by which man hard-pressed foresees that good may come out of evil. They test man's faith in life: the twins show this quality too, by contrast with the initially life-denying attitudes of Orsino and Olivia. The most inclusive quality they test is patience, in the full Renaissance sense which the late romances share with Sidney's Arcadia:³ the monumental patience of Viola's "sister" is partly a self-image (II.iv.113).

A new attitude towards romance is being sought throughout this exploration of fortune, its agents and the responses it evokes. As usual in Shakespearean romance the love-interest dominates and tends to absorb the other elements, so that the adventures, marvels and themes which matter most are those involved in the treatment of love. On the other hand some of the methods of integrating the four elements are new. Physical adventure is used more consistently to

¹Cf. WT IV.i.1-2, quoted above: Time tries, or tests, all.

²The one shows the desired buoyancy while escaping shipwreck like an Arion, the other in playing the part of Cesario.

³J.F. Danby, Elizabethan and Jacobean Poets, p.70, cf. pp.80 and 85.

dignify character. The marvels are internalized in a new way, because the wondering response of imagination to marvellous happenings has become as significant as the happenings themselves. Finally and fundamentally, although feelings remain important they are seen to be closely conditioned by events; and now that events admit of moral and causal explanation, feelings themselves acquire more metaphysical implications. Shakespeare is, it seems, examining the relationship of character to event.

It may be objected that to find such abstract ideas in Twelfth Night is to make the play too metaphysical, over-earnest. Of course it is often amusing, sometimes earthy, and yet serious and metaphysical implication is, I believe, also present. (Disturbing, un-comic potential has long been recognized in the fate of Malvolio). A different sort of objection to this metaphysics of romance would be that its view of reality is too selective, too naively optimistic. It is probably natural for a twentieth-century person to demand a world-view with more awareness of pain and more acid, but of course Shakespeare has used the accommodating power of romance to include these more bitter possibilities. In any case the point is that he not only exploits the latent metaphysics of romance, but perceives the nature and meaning of what he exploits (just as in As You Like It he explores the latent philosophy of pastoral). Perhaps he is more concerned--especially in comedy, where the element of mental "play" is greater than in tragedy--with the expressive possibilities of an idea than with its literal plausibility.¹

¹ Cf. the case of the fairies in MND, or the witches in Macbeth, or indeed the supernatural in any form.

Comparison of the play with its sources supports this opinion, since they too mention fortune, patience and so forth, but briefly, conventionally and—compared with Twelfth Night—unsystematically. According to its Prologue Gl'Ingannati will teach the audience "two lessons above all...how great is the power of chance and good fortune in affairs of love; and how great too in them is the value of long-enduring patience accompanied by good counsel" (Bullough, II.288). These "lessons" are supposed to be taught by Lelia and Isabella ("two young women"), but as they show opportunism, in the usual manner of intrigue comedy, more than patience, it is hard to take the Prologue's claim as more than conventional. Similarly in the play itself Lelia thanks her "good fortune" that she is appointed page by Flamminio (II.296); and he reciprocates by speaking of the "strange accident" of his affection for the page (III.310), but the emphasis on fortune is not sustained. Barnabe Riche promises more, since he adds a storm and a shipwreck to the story-tradition, and speaks emphatically of "the onely providence of God" as the means by which Silla escapes from the "wonderfull storme" which killed everyone else on the ship (Bullough, II.349-350). Yet notwithstanding that there is metaphysical causation in the reference to Providence, and in the implication (II.349) that the storm is an answer to Silla's prayers when she is beset by the captain's unwelcome proposals; the metaphysical interest disappears, never to be revived. Shakespeare prefers not to introduce Riche's "God" into his story, reverting to a vaguer, less personal "fortune". But he does retain the storm and the wreck,

and the good fortune of those who survive. Above all he maintains and systematizes the part of fortune, fate, or what you will, as an ultimately beneficent influence on the characters. In doing so he takes hints from the sources, but the degree of expansion indicates that his own interests are deeper. Similarly if we compare the treatment of fortune and time in As You Like It—in which, certainly, the themes are more noticeable than in its predecessors—we notice their increased importance for Twelfth Night, since whereas Rosalind controls events, once she has abandoned the denaturing, fortune-dominated court, and stage-manages her own wedding, Viola is controlled by events. Unlike Rosalind she must wait, and be patient; and even though there is a benign principle behind the events of Twelfth Night the freedom of individuals has diminished. What is more, Jaques and Touchstone were unheroic commentators in the earlier play in whose moralizing fortune and time were often mentioned (e.g. II.vii.12-43), yet without our being required to think them more, on the whole, than morally negative and entertaining, respectively. Their counterparts in the present comedy however have a different force. Malvolio is more involved in the action than Jaques and much more decisively exposed and humiliated, which is a bitter strain in the final harmonies; and more than that, his failure to be loved and refusal to be reconciled emphasize the possibility, inimical to comedy, that patient waiting may bring no reward—the case of Hamlet. Conversely Feste is not more but less involved in the action than Touchstone, yet his effect repeats that of Malvolio: his comments are never disabled by the imputation of

sour grapes, as are those of Jaques, nor are they contained by the force of the normative characters, as are those of Touchstone. He has--literally--the last word, and it must be significant that it concerns Time. What he says about it runs counter to the intimations of the lovers, for he suggests that time is linear rather than cyclic, endless and belittling rather than benign.

Having given to conventional romance ideas of fortune and time a new definition and profundity, Shakespeare chooses to close upon a note which modifies romantic optimism and indeed distances the whole magnified heroic world. The power of romance to include perspectives upon itself was never more radically demonstrated, even in The Tempest, than in the words with which the clown returns us on Shakespeare's behalf from the imagined world of romance and festivity to the confused world of fact and everyday labour.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

CONCLUSION

Twelfth Night is, as we have said, a masterpiece of combination. The combination is particularly interesting because its modes differ from those of preceding comedies. One difference is concerned with the intricacy of the play's relationships to its story-tradition: Twelfth Night has connections with not one but several works within the tradition of Gl'Ingannati, including the latter play itself, and all these works stand within the tradition of Menaechmi. An equally unusual feature is the extent of self-borrowing (another form of combination) in the play, which introduces further points of connection with the story-tradition: we can see Shakespeare literally surpassing himself. Thirdly the use of genres in Twelfth Night is unusual: not because genres are combined, for this is Shakespeare's frequent practice, but because of the manner of their combination. Romance and intrigue are more clearly being explored until a sense of their meaning, capacity and limitations is suggested. Hence of course the greater length of the chapter which deals with Twelfth Night, for we have attempted to do justice to the unusual variety of sources and balancing of the types of source-relationships, just as the chapter on As You Like It attempted to do justice to the unusual degree of dependence upon a single version of a single story-source in that comedy.

Yet the mention of As You Like It is a reminder that the brilliance in combining which one notices in Twelfth Night is not peculiar to that play, nor is it peculiar to comedies having complex

source-relationships: though As You Like It shows an equal fertility and complexity in juxtapositions they are the outcome, mostly, of a judicious selection of a single main source. In other words Shakespeare's growth towards the perfect embodiment of a comic idea, which is certainly felt more strongly the nearer one comes to these two plays, is not the product of changing ways of choosing and moulding sources, at least in their primary sense of "story-sources". It could in fact be misleading to conclude that just as the plays become more complex and more searching so does the handling of story-sources. Shakespeare already displays a magnificent competence in converting Menaechmi into Errors, with its positive difference of emotional range and intensity, or in combining materials that are heterogeneous indeed into the fine, homogeneous fabric of A Dream. Similarly, it has been shown that although As You Like It and Twelfth Night are the most complex of the ten comedies their source-relationships stand in striking contrast with one another. It may therefore be unwise to seek to discern a pattern of development in the relations of the comedies to their story-sources: what we find in all three of the periods we have distinguished is variety of source-relationship. All we can say is that the extremes of invention, in Love's Labour's Lost, and of dependence on a single story-source, in As You Like It, are not repeated elsewhere within the ten comedies; and also that it is characteristic of Shakespeare to combine two or more story-sources since he does so in all except As You Like It (where Lodge had already done much of the combining) and perhaps The Shrew (if its source already contained the triple plot). Indeed a propensity for combining materials can be seen even where, as in The Merchant or As You Like It, he selects a story-source which has

already combined contrasting stories or characters; for the same delights in diversity is at work here which is more readily observed in plays, for example Love's Labour's Lost or Much Ado, where he elects to invent the contrasting elements. Such findings are not exciting of course or new; but the purpose, and I think the value, of our extended discussions of source-story indebtedness does not lie in such hopes but rather in their tracing of Shakespeare's fineness of selection, omission and alteration--a value which is not jeopardised when we recognize that that fineness is to some extent a constant, as well as a developing, factor within the comedies.

Where one does notice development is in such aspects as significant juxtapositions of character (As You Like It vis`à vis Love's Labour's Lost) or the exploitation of multiple awareness (Twelfth Night vis`à vis The Two Gentlemen). In considering the ways in which Shakespeare's own earlier work may have benefited a play, we have frequently had occasion to notice particular advances; nevertheless to chart such advances in any comprehensive way would have taken our inquiry beyond the terms of source-study, even in the extended senses which we added at the outset to the paradigm sense of "story-source", and into a critical account of Shakespeare's growth to artistic maturity. Such a territory is too vast to be charted in what is essentially a more limited undertaking, even though the comparisons entailed by regarding a play's predecessors as among its sources do suggest compass-bearings for the more purely critical inquiry.

Generic debts on the other hand can indicate changing directions and increasingly assured intelligence in Shakespeare's comic writing, his attitudes to romance being particularly pertinent in this regard; yet they too have their limitations. Not only do genres overlap a good deal (comedy with romance, romance with pastoral, and so on) and prove hard in practice to distinguish from the story-sources which stand within them, but also for Shakespeare, of all writers, we should not impute too much too readily to generic indebtedness since he outstrips the unremarkable commonplaces of genre so soon and so radically. Thus even an early and in places unconvincing play like The Two Gentlemen does not limply rely on romance convention but includes perspectives upon the genre; nor are these perspectives the simple inversion of romance into parody, but an elaborate interweaving and interaction of its comic and serious capabilities. At the same time, however, it is precisely in the increasingly mature way Shakespeare juxtaposes opposites, so that they bring out each other's significance, that his development is clearest. The greater maturity is assisted by an increasingly appropriate choice of generic affiliations in his story-sources. Thus in the early Shrew, or even the later Merchant and Much Ado, the simple sympathies of traditional stories, determined originally by genre, may impede our full acceptance of Shakespeare's far more complex intention--for I take it that the sense of unease which Katherina, Shylock and Claudio may still occasion derives from a tension felt between their plot-role and its moral implication--but we have no such doubt that the generic connections of the materials of As You Like It and Twelfth Night are appropriate. The

pastoral presuppositions of Rosalynde enable the dramatist to construct an elaborate antithesis of court life and country life, and to hint at a synthesis of both which is nearer to perfection than either. Likewise the power of romance to accommodate materials from other genres along with their inherent, unromantic or antiromantic world-views enables Shakespeare in Twelfth Night to explore the fundamental purport of romance itself, while even so mocking and modifying its perfection. Evidently therefore, although Shakespeare's ability to improve and articulate a source-story, at the level of dramaturgical competence, is remarkably mature even in the earliest comedies, his ability to elicit underlying affinities and meanings of a tradition is an index of what is not constant but developing--within, but also beyond, the comedies of our period.

The abiding impression left, then, by a study of Shakespeare's use of sources--whether the detail of the plays or their total organization be in question--is admiration, of his tact in selecting and discarding, his fertility in thematic insight and his poetic power to bring alive what was dead, or had never been alive, in his sources. By a paradox a critically oriented source-study has its own ways of revealing Shakespeare's incomparable originality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Bibliography is in three sections: 1) Shakespeare texts; 2) Other primary texts; 3) Secondary works, whether of scholarship or criticism. In the first section the complete works come first, then editions of single plays in alphabetical order of play-titles. In the second section source-collections come first, and then, alphabetically, primary texts which are not in these collections. In the third section the order is purely alphabetical.

1. SHAKESPEARE TEXTS.

William Shakespeare. The Complete Works. A New Edition. Edited with an Introduction and Glossary by P. Alexander, 1951.

As You Like It, ed. A. Gilman, Signet Classic Shakespeare, New York, 1963.

_____ ed. J.W. Holme, The Arden Shakespeare, 1914.

_____ ed. H.J. Oliver, New Penguin Shakespeare, 1968.

The Comedy of Errors, ed. R.A. Foakes, New Arden Edition, 1962.

_____ ed. H. Levin, Signet Classic Shakespeare, 1965.

Love's Labour's Lost, ed. J. Arthos, Signet Classic Shakespeare, New York, 1965.

_____ ed. R. David, revised edn., New Arden Edition, 1956.

The Merchant of Venice, ed. J.R. Brown, New Arden Edition, 1955.

_____ ed. W.M. Merchant, New Penguin Shakespeare, 1967.

_____ ed. K. Myrick, Signet Classic Shakespeare, 1965.

_____ ed. C. Knox Pooler, 5th edn., The Arden Shakespeare, 1927.

Shakespeare's Merry Wives of Windsor. 1602, ed. W.W. Greg, Oxford, 1910.

The Merry Wives of Windsor, ed. H.C. Hart, The Arden Shakespeare, 1904.

A Midsummer Night's Dream, ed. W. Clemen, Signet Classic Shakespeare, 1963.

_____ ed. H. Cuningham, The Arden Shakespeare, 1905.

_____ ed. S. Wells, New Penguin Shakespeare, 1967.

- Much Ado about Nothing, ed. R.A. Foakes, New Penguin Shakespeare, 1968.
- _____ ed. D.L. Stevenson, Signet Classic Shakespeare, 1964.
- _____ ed. G.R. Trenery, The Arden Shakespeare, 1924.
- Pericles Prince of Tyre, ed. F.D. Hoeniger, New Arden Edition, 1963.
- The Taming of the Shrew, ed. R.B. Heilman, Signet Classic Shakespeare, 1966.
- The Tempest, ed. F. Kermode, revised edn., New Arden Edition, 1958.
- Twelfth Night, ed. H. Baker, Signet Classic Shakespeare, 1965.
- Twelfth Night or What You Will, ed. M. Luce, 4th edn., The Arden Shakespeare, 1929.
- Twelfth Night, ed. M.M. Mahood, New Penguin Shakespeare, 1968.
- The Two Gentlemen of Verona, ed. B. Evans, Signet Classic Shakespeare, 1964.
- _____ ed. C. Leech, New Arden Edition, 1969.
- _____ ed. N. Sanders, New Penguin Shakespeare, 1968.

2. OTHER PRIMARY TEXTS.

- Bullough, G. ed. Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, 7 vols., 1957-.
- Collier, J.P. and Hazlitt, W.C. Shakespeare's Library. A Collection of the Plays, Romances, Novels, Poems and Histories Employed by Shakespeare in the Composition of his Works...Second Edn.. Carefully Revised and Greatly Enlarged. The Text Now First Formed from a New Collation of the Original Copies [i.e. Hazlitt's revision of Collier's Shakespeare's Library of 1843], 2 vols., 1875.
- Ariosto, L. Sir John Harington's Translation of Orlando Furioso by Lodovico Ariosto, ed. G. Hough, 1962.
- Apuleius. The Golden Ass: Being the Metamorphoses of Lucius Apuleius with an English Translation by W. Adlington (1566), revised by S. Caselee, Loeb Classical Library, 1915.
- Ballads. The English and Scottish Popular Ballads, ed. F.J. Child, 5 vols., Boston, Mass., 1882-98, as reissued in 3 vols., New York, 1957.
- Bandello, M. Le Novelle, ed. G. Brognoligo, 5 vols., Bari, 1910-12.
- Beaumont, F. The Knight of the Burning Pestle (1613), ed. M.C. Bradbrook, Everyman edn. of Beaumont and Fletcher, 1962.
- The Bible. References are normally to the Authorized Version, 1611.

- Boccaccio, G. The Decameron, tr. J.M. Rigg, as reprinted in the Everyman edn., 2 vols., 1930.
- Chaucer, G. The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. Edited from Numerous MSS by the Rev. W.W. Skeat, Oxford, 1912.
- Child Ballads. See Ballads.
- Clvomon and Clamydes. ed. W.W. Greg, Malone Society Reprint, 1913.
- Elyot, Sir Thomas. The Book Named The Governor, ed. S.E. Lehmborg, Everyman edn., 1962.
- Gesta Romanorum: or, Entertaining Moral Stories: Invented by the Monks as a Fireside Recreation, and Commonly Applied in their Discourses from the Pulpit: Whence the Most Celebrated of our own Poets and Others, from the Earliest Times, Have Extracted their Plots, tr. C. Swan (1824), revised by W. Hooper, 1877.
- Gesta Romanorum. The Early English Versions of the Gesta Romanorum, ed. S.J.H. Herrtage, Early English Text Society, e.s., 33, 1879.
- Gl'Ingannati. Gl'Ingannati degli Accademici Intronati di Siena. An Italian Comedy of the Sixteenth Century, Edinburgh, 1943.
- Laelia. A Comedy Acted at Queens' College, Cambridge. Probably on March 1st, 1595. Now First Printed. With an Introduction and Notes by G.C. Moore Smith, Cambridge, 1910.
- Lodge, T. Rosalynde. Being the Original of Shakespeare's AYL, ed. W.W. Greg, Shakespeare Classics, 1907.
- Lyly, J. The Complete Works of John Lyly Now for the First Time Collected and Edited from the Earliest Quartos with Life, Bibliography, Essays, Notes and Index, ed. R.W. Bond, 3 vols., Oxford, 1902.
- Marlowe, C. The Jew of Malta, ed. H.S. Bennett, 1931.
- Masuccio Salernitano. The Novellino, tr. W.G. Waters, 2 vols., 1895.
- Montemayor, J. de. A Critical Edition of Yong's Translation of George of Montemayor's Diana and Gil Polo's Enamoured Diana, ed. J.M. Kennedy, Oxford, 1968.
- Nashe, T. The Works of Thomas Nashe, ed. R.B. McKerrow, 5 vols., 1904-10, reprinted with corrections, Oxford, 1958.
- Ovid. Ovid's Metamorphoses with an English Translation by F.J. Miller, Loeb Classical Library, 2 vols., 1916.
- Peele, G. The Old Wives' Tale, in Five Elizabethan Comedies, ed. A.K. MacIlwraith, 1934.

Plautus. Plautus with an English Translation by Paul Nixon, Loeb Classical Library, 5 vols., 1916-38.

Riche, B. Rich's "Apolonius & Silla", an Original of Shakespeare's TN, ed. M. Luce, Shakespeare Classics, 1912.

_____. Rich's Farewell to Military Profession, 1531, ed. in facsimile by T.M. Cranfill, Austin, Texas, 1959.

Straparola, G.F. Le Piacevoli Notti: tr. as The Nights of Straparola by W.G. Waters, 2 vols., 1894.

Yong. See Montemayor.

3. SECONDARY WORKS.

Allen, M.S. "Brooke's Romeus and Juliet as a Source for the Valentine-Sylvia Plot in TGV", U. of Texas Studies in English, XVIII, 1938, pp.25-46.

Altick, R.D. The Art of Literary Research, New York, 1963.

Anders, H.R.D. Shakespeare's Books. A Dissertation on Shakespeare's Reading and the Immediate Sources of his Works, Schriften der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, Band I, Berlin, 1904.

Baldwin, T.W. On the Compositional Genetics of CE, Urbana, Illinois, 1965.

_____. On the Literary Genetics of Shakespeare's Plays 1592-1594, Urbana, Illinois, 1959.

_____. Shakespeare's Five-Act Structure: Shakespeare's Early Plays on the Background of Renaissance Theories of Five-Act Structure from 1470, Urbana, Illinois, 1947.

_____. Shakespeare's Love's Labor's Won. New Evidence from the Account Books of an Elizabethan Bookseller, Carbondale, Illinois, 1957.

Barber, C.L. Shakespeare's Festive Comedy. A Study of Dramatic Form and its Relation to Social Custom, Princeton, New Jersey, 1959.

Bartlett, J. A Complete Concordance or Verbal Index to Words, Phrases and Passages in the Dramatic Works of Shakespeare with a Supplementary Concordance to the Poems, 1894.

Beer, G. The Romance, 1970

Berry, R. "The Words of Mercury", Shakespeare Survey, XXII, 1969, pp.69-77.

Bethurum, D. "Shakespeare's Comment on Mediaeval Romance in MND", MLN, LX, 1945, pp.85-94.

- Boas, F.S. University Drama in the Tudor Age, Oxford, 1914.
- Bonnard, G. "Shakespeare's Purpose in MND", ShJ, XCII, 1956, pp.263-279.
- Boswell-Stone, W.G. See Stone.
- Boughner, D.C. "Don Armado and the Commedia dell' Arte", SP, XXXVII, 1940, pp.201-224.
- Bradbrook, M.C. The Growth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy, 1955, as reprinted in the Penguin (Peregrine) edn., 1963.
- _____. Shakespeare and Elizabethan Poetry. A Study of his Earlier Work in Relation to the Poetry of the Time, 1951, as reprinted in the Penguin (Peregrine) edn., 1964.
- Braddy, H. "Shakespeare's Puck and Froissart's Orthon", ShQ, VII, 1956, pp.276-280.
- Briggs, K.M. The Anatomy of Puck. An Examination of Fairy Beliefs among Shakespeare's Contemporaries and Successors, 1959.
- Brooks, H.F. "Themes and Structure in CE", in Stratford-upon-Avon Studies, III. Early Shakespeare, 1961, pp.54-71.
- _____. "Two Clowns in a Comedy (To Say Nothing of the Dog): Speed, Launce (and Crab) in TGV", Essays and Studies, XVI, 1963, ed. S.G. Putt, pp.91-100.
- Brown, B.D. "Medieval Prototypes of Lorenzo and Jessica", MLN, XLIV, 1929, pp.227-232.
- Brown, J.R. "The Interpretation of Shakespeare's Comedies: 1900-1953", Shakespeare Survey, VIII, 1955, pp.1-13.
- _____. Shakespeare and his Comedies, 1957.
- Bryan, W.F. and Dempster, G. ed. Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales, Chicago, 1941.
- Bullough, G. ed. Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, 7 vols., 1957-.
- Campbell, O.J. and Quinn, E.G. ed. A Shakespeare Encyclonaedia, 1966.
- Cardozo, J.L. The Contemporary Jew in the Elizabethan Drama, Amsterdam, 1925.
- Chambers, E.K. The Elizabethan Stage, 4 vols., Oxford, 1923.
- _____. Shakespeare: A Survey, 1925, as reprinted in the Penguin (Pelican) edn., 1964.
- _____. William Shakespeare. A Study of Facts and Problems, 2 vols., Oxford, 1930.
- Charlton, H.B. Shakespearian Comedy, 1938.

- Connely, W. "When Plautus Is Greater than Shakespeare", Classical Journal, XIX, 1923-4, pp.303-305.
- Coulter, C.C. "The Plautine Tradition in Shakespeare", JEGP, XIX, 1920, pp.66-83.
- Craig, H. "Motivation in Shakespeare's Choice of Materials", Shakespeare Survey, IV, 1951, pp.26-34.
- _____. "Shakespeare and Wilson's Arte of Rhetorique, an Inquiry into the Criteria for Determining Sources", SP, XXVIII, 1931, pp.618-630.
- Creizenach, W. The English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare, [Vol. IV, Bks. i-viii of Geschichte des neueren Dramas], tr. C. Hugon, 1916.
- Curtius, E.R. European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, tr. W.R. Trask, New York, 1953.
- Danby, J.F. Poets on Fortune's Hill. Studies in Sidney, Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher, 1952: re-entitled Elizabethan and Jacobean Poets. Studies in Sidney, Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher, 1964.
- _____. "Shakespeare Criticism and TGV", CQ, II, 1960, pp.309-321.
- Doran, M. Endeavors of Art: A Study of Form in Elizabethan Drama, Madison, Wisconsin, 1954.
- _____. "MND: A Metamorphosis", The Rice Institute Pamphlet, XLVI, No. 4, 1960, pp.113-135.
- Dunlop, J. The History of Fiction: Being a Critical Account of the Most Celebrated Prose Works of Fiction, from the Earliest Greek Romances to the Novels of the Present Age, 4th edn., revised by H. Wilson, 2 vols., London, 1888.
- Evans, B. Shakespeare's Comedies, Oxford, 1960.
- Fender, S. Shakespeare. A Midsummer Night's Dream, Studies in English Literature, 1968.
- Fink, Z.S. "Jaques and the Malcontent Traveler", PQ, XIV, 1935, pp.237-252.
- Forsythe, R.S. "MW: Two New Analogues", PQ, VII, 1928, pp.390-398.
- _____. "A Plautine Source of MW", MPhil., XVIII, 1920, pp.401-421.
- Freeburg, V.O. Disguise Plots in Elizabethan Drama. A Study in Stage Tradition, Columbia U. Studies in English and Comparative Literature, New York, 1915.
- Frye, N. Anatomy of Criticism. Four Essays, Princeton, New Jersey, 1957.
- _____. A Natural Perspective. The Development of Shakespearean Comedy and Romance, New York, 1965.

- Gardner, H. "AYL", in More Talking of Shakespeare, ed. J. Garrett, 1959, pp.17-32.
- Gaw, A. "The Evolution of CE", PMLA, XLI, 1926,ppp 620-666.
- Gill, E.M. "A Comparison of the Characters in CE with those in the Menaechni", U. of Texas Studies in English, V, 1925, pp.79-95.
- _____. "The Plot-Structure of CE in Relation to the Sources", U. of Texas Studies in English, X, 1930, pp.13-65.
- Graves, R. The Greek Myths, 2 vols., 1955.
- Green, W. Shakespeare's MWW, Princeton, New Jersey, 1962.
- Greenlaw, E. "Shakespeare's Pastorals", SP, XIII, 1916, pp.122-154.
- Greg, W.W. Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama: A Literary Inquiry, with Special Reference to the Pre-Restoration Stage in England, 1906.
- Grierson, H.J.C. Cross Currents in English Literature of the Seventeenth Century: Or. The World, the Flesh and the Spirit, their Actions and Reactions, (The Messenger Lectures 1926-7), 1929.
- Griffith, T.G. Bandello's Fiction. An Examination of the Novelle, Modern Language Studies, Oxford, 1955.
- Guttmann, S. The Foreign Sources of Shakespeare's Works. An Annotated Bibliography of the Commentary Written on this Subject between 1904 and 1940 together with Lists of Certain Translations Available to Shakespeare, New York, 1947.
- Haight, E.H. "Apollonius of Tyre and Shakespeare's PPT", in More Essays on Greek Romances, New York, 1945, pp.142-189.
- _____. "Chariton's Chaereas and Callirhoe", in Essays on the Greek Romances, New York, 1943, pp.14-37.
- Hallett Smith. See Smith (Hallett).
- Halliday, F.E. A Shakespeare Companion 1550-1950, 1952.
- Harbage, A.B. As They Liked It. An Essay on Shakespeare and Morality, New York, 1947.
- _____. Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions, New York, 1952.
- _____. Shakespeare's Audience, New York, 1941.
- Harrison, T.P. "Concerning TGV and Montemayor's Diana", MLN, XLI, 1926, pp.251-252.
- _____. "Shakespeare and Montemayor's Diana", U. of Texas Studies in English, VI, 1926, pp.72-120.

- Herford, C.H. "Shakespeare's Treatment of Love and Marriage, and Other Essays, 1921.
- Herrick, M.T. Italian Comedy in the Renaissance, Urbana, Illinois, 1960.
- Hight, G. The Classical Tradition. Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature, Oxford, 1949.
- Hotson, L. The First Night of Twelfth Night, 1954.
- Hunter, G.K. John Lyly. The Humanist as Courtier, 1962.
- _____ review of T.W. Baldwin, On the Literary Genetics of Shakespeare's Plays, 1592-1594, RES, n.s.XII, 1961, pp. 189-195.
- _____ William Shakespeare. The Late Comedies: MND, MA, AYL, TN, Writers and their Work, 1962.
- Jenkins, H. "AYL", in Shakespeare Survey, VIII, 1955, pp.40-51.
- _____ "Peele's Old Wive's Tale", MLR, XXXIV, 1939, pp.177-185.
- _____ "Shakespeare's TN", Rice Institute Pamphlet, XLV, No. 4, 1959, pp.19-42.
- "Jews in Britain etc." See "Orthodox Jews".
- Kennedy, J.M. A Critical Edition of Yong's Translation of George of Montemayor's Diana and Gil Polo's Enamoured Diana, Oxford, 1968.
- Kermode, F. "The Mature Comedies", in Stratford-upon-Avon Studies, III. Early Shakespeare, 1961, pp.210-227.
- Kernodle, G.R. Invitation to the Theatre, New York, 1967.
- Kott, J. Shakespeare our Contemporary, tr. B. Taboriski, 2nd edn., 1967.
- Kryzanowski, J. Shakespearian Modifications--Methodical Prolegomena, Wroclaw, 1948.
- Lascelles, M. "Shakespeare's Comic Insight", PBA, XLVIII, 1962, pp.171-186.
- _____ "Shakespeare's Pastoral Comedy", in More Talking of Shakespeare, ed. J. Garrett, 1959, pp.70-86.
- Latham, M.W. The Elizabethan Fairies. The Fairies of Folklore and the Fairies of Shakespeare, Columbia U. Studies in English and Comparative Literature, New York, 1930.
- Law, R.A. "The Pre-conceived Pattern' of MND", U. of Texas Studies in English, XXIII, 1943, pp.5-14.

- Lea, K.M. Italian Popular Comedy. A Study in the Commedia dell' Arte, 1560-1620 with Special Reference to the English Stage, 2 vols., Oxford, 1934.
- Leech, C. "Shakespeare's Comic Dukes", REL, V.2, 1964, pp.101-114.
- _____. TN and Shakespearian Comedy, Three Lectures, 1965.
- Lewis, C.S. The Allegory of Love. A Study in Medieval Tradition, Oxford, 1936.
- _____. English Literature in the Sixteenth Century Excluding Drama. The Completion of the Clark Lectures, Trinity College, Cambridge, Oxford, 1954.
- Lincoln, E.T. ed. Pastoral and Romance. Modern Essays in Criticism, New York, 1969.
- The Listener, 4.12.1969. See "Orthodox Jews".
- Loomis, R.S. The Development of Arthurian Romance, 1963.
- MacQueen, J. "AYL and Mediaeval Literary Tradition", Forum for Modern Language Studies, I, 1965, pp.216-229.
- McIntosh, A. "AYL: a Grammatical Clue to Character", REL, IV,2, 1963, pp.68-81.
- Mathew, G. "Marriage and Amour Courtois in Late Fourteenth-Century England", in Essays Presented to Charles Williams, ed. C.S. Lewis, 1947, pp.128-135.
- Mincoff, M. "Shakespeare and Lyly", Shakespeare Survey, XIV, 1961, pp.15-24.
- _____. "What Shakespeare Did to Rosalynde", ShJ, XCVI, 1960, pp.78-89.
- Moody, A.D. Shakespeare: The Merchant of Venice, Studies in English Literature, 1964.
- Mueschke, P. and Fleisher, J. "Jonsonian Elements in the Comic Underplot of TN", PMLA, XLVIII, 1933, pp.722-740.
- Muir, K. "Pyramus and Thisbe: A Study in Shakespeare's Method", ShQ, V, 1954, pp.141-153.
- _____. Shakespeare as Collaborator, 1960.
- _____. Shakespeare's Sources, 1957-, Vol. I, 1957, Comedies and Tragedies.
- Muir, K. and Bateson, F.W. Editorial Commentary [on principles of source-criticism], EC, IV, 1954, pp.432-440.
- Mulryne, J.R. Shakespeare: Much Ado about Nothing, Studies in English Literature, 1965.

- Munro, J.J. Brooke's "Romeus and Juliet" Being the Original of Shakespeare's RJ Newly Edited by J.J. Munro, Shakespeare Classics, 1908.
- Neill, K. "More Ado about Claudio: An Acquittal for the Slandered Groom", ShQ, III, 1952, pp.91-107.
- Nicoll, A. The Theatre and Dramatic Theory, 1962.
- Nicoll, A. The Theory of Drama, 1931.
- Noble, R. Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge and Use of the Book of Common Prayer, as Exemplified in the Plays of the First Folio, 1935.
- Olson, P.A. "MND and the Meaning of Court Marriage", ELH, XXIV, 1957, pp.95-119.
- "Orthodox Jews in Britain--Portrait of a Community", from a Radio-4 documentary narrated by Anne Owen, The Listener, 4.12.1969, pp.786-789.
- Owen, S.G. "Ovid and Romance", in English Literature and the Classics, ed. G.S. Gordon, Oxford, 1912, pp.167-195.
- Palmer, D.J. "Art and Nature in TN", CQ, IX, 1967, pp.201-212.
- Panofsky, E. "Et in Arcadia Ego. On the Conception of Transience in Poussin and Watteau", in Philosophy and History. Essays Presented to Ernst Cassirer, ed. R. Klibansky and H.J. Paton, 1936, pp.223-254.
- Parks, G.B. "The Development of TGV", Huntington Library Bulletin, XI, April 1937, pp.1-11.
- Parrott, T.M. Shakespearean Comedy, New York, 1949.
- Perry, T.A. "Proteus, Wry-Transformed Traveller", ShQ, V, 1954, pp.33-40.
- Pettet, E.C. Shakespeare and the Romance Tradition, 1949.
- Pettigrew, H.P. "Bassanio, the Elizabethan Lover", PQ, XVI, 1937, pp.296-306.
- Phialas, P.G. Shakespeare's Romantic Comedies. The Development of their Form and Meaning, Chapel Hill, N.C., 1966.
- Pitcher, S.M. "Two Notes on Shakespeare: I. Launcelot's Blessing", PQ, XXI, 1942, p.239.
- Prouty, C.T. "Some Observations on Shakespeare's Sources", ShJ, XCVI, 1960, pp.64-77.
- _____. The Sources of MA. A Critical Study, together with the Text of Peter Beverley's Ariodante and Ieneura, New Haven, Conn., 1950.
- Pruvost, R. Matteo Bandello and Elizabethan Fiction, Paris, 1937.
- Robinson, J.W. "Palpable Hot Ice: Dramatic Burlesque in MND", SP, LXI, 1964, pp.192-204.

- Roesen, B. "LLL", ShQ, IV, 1953, pp.411-426.
- Root, R.K. Classical Mythology in Shakespeare, Yale Studies in English, XIX, New York, 1965 (reprint of 1903 edn.).
- Rossiter, A.P. "MA", in Angel with Horns and Other Shakespeare Lectures, ed. G.Storey, 1961, pp.65-81.
- Russell, P. "Romantic Narrative Plays: 1570-1590", in Stratford-upon-Avon Studies, IX, Elizabethan Theatre, pp.106-129.
- Salingar, L.G. "The Design of TN", ShQ, IX, 1958, pp.117-139.
- Sanders, N. "The Comedy of Greene and Shakespeare", in Stratford-upon-Avon Studies, III, Early Shakespeare, 1961, pp.34-53.
- Sargent, R.M. "Sir Thomas Elyot and the Integrity of TGV", PMLA, LXV, 1950, pp.116-80.
- Schanzer, E. "The Central Theme of MND", U. of Toronto Quarterly, XX.3, 1951, pp.233-238.
- Schlauch, M. "The Pound of Flesh Story in the North", JEGP, XXX, 1931, pp.343-360.
- Schrickx, W. Shakespeare's Early Contemporaries: the Background of the Harvey-Nashe Polemic and LLL, Antwerp, 1956.
- Scott, M.A. Elizabethan Translations from the Italian, Boston, Mass., 1916.
- Shaw, J. "Fortune and Nature in AYL", ShQ, VI, 1955, pp.45-50.
- Shearman, J. Mannerism, Pelican Bks. Style and Civilization Series, 1967.
- Sidgwick, F. ed. The Sources and Analogues of MND, Shakespeare Classics, 1908.
- Sinsheimer, H. Shylock. The History of a Character. or. The Myth of the Jew, 1947.
- Small, S.A. "The Ending of TGV", PMLA, XLVIII, 1933, pp.767-776.
- Smith (Hallett). Elizabethan Poetry. A Study in Conventions. Meaning and Expression, Cambridge, Mass., 1952.
- Smith, J. "AYL", Scrutiny, IX, 1940, pp.9-32.
- Smith (Toulmin). "On the Bond-Story in MV, and a Version of it in the Cursor Mundi", The New Shakespeare Society's Transactions, I.3-4, 1875-6, pp.181-189.
- Spevack, M. A Complete and Systematic Concordance to the Works of Shakespeare, 6 vols., Hildesheim, 1963-70.

- Sorieri, L. Boccaccio's Story of Tito e Gisippo in European Literature, New York, 1937.
- Stith Thompson. See Thompson (Stith).
- Stone: Boswell-Stone, W.G. "Shakspeare's AYL and Lodge's Rosalynde Compared", Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society, 1880-5, Part II (Series I, No. 9), pp.277-293.
- Thompson, K.F. "Shakespeare's Romantic Comedies", PMLA, LXVII, 1952, pp.1079-93.
- Thompson (Stith). Motif-Index of Folk-Literature. A Classification of Narrative Elements in Folktales, Ballads, Myths, Fables, Mediaeval Romances, Exemplary Fables, Jest-Books and Local Legends, 6 vols., Copenhagen and Bloomington, Indiana, 1955.
- Thorndike, A.H. "The Relation of AYL to Robin Hood Plays", JEGP, IV, 1902, pp.59-69.
- Tillyard, E.M.W. Shakespeare's Early Comedies, ed. S. Tillyard, 1965.
- Tolman, A.H. "Shakespeare's Manipulation of his Sources in AYL", MLN, XXXVII, 1922, pp.65-76.
- Toulmin Smith. See Smith (Toulmin).
- Traversi, D.A. An Approach to Shakespeare, 3rd edn., 2 vols., New York, 1969.
- Tynan, J.L. "The Influence of Greene on Shakspeare's Early Romance", PMLA, XXVII, 1912, pp.246-264.
- Wain, J. The Living World of Shakespeare. A Playgoers Guide, 1964, as reprinted in Penguin (Pelican) edn., 1966.
- Wallace, M.W. The Birthe of Hercules. With an Introduction on the Influence of Plautus on the Dramatic Literature of England in the Sixteenth Century, Chicago, 1903.
- Wells, S. "The Failure of TGV", ShJ, IC, 1963, pp.161-173.
- Whitaker, V.K. Shakespeare's Use of Learning. An Inquiry into the Growth of his Mind and Art, San Marino, California, 1953.
- White, H.O. Plagiarism and Invitation During the English Renaissance. A Study in Critical Distinctions, Harvard Studies in English, Vol. XII, Cambridge, Mass., 1935.
- Wilson, F.P. The English Drama 1485-1585, ed. with a Bibliography by G.K. Hunter, Oxford, 1969.
- Wilson, J.L. "Another Medieval Parallel to the Jessica and Lorenzo Story", Shakespeare Association Bulletin, XXIII, 1948, pp.20-23.
- Wolff, S.L. The Creek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction, New York, 1912.

Wright, H.G. ed. Early English Versions of the Tales of Guiscardo and Ghismonda and Titus and Gisippus from the Decameron, Early English Text Society, 1937.

Wright, L.B. Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England, Chapel Hill, N.C., 1935.

Yates, F.A. A Study of LLL, Shakespeare Problems, No. V, Cambridge, 1936.